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This qualitative case study examines the nature of a dual language preschool teacher’s instructional practices and extratextual talk during shared-book reading practices with two different genres of books in Spanish and English. Specifically, I explore the interpersonal, ideational, and textual features of one teacher’s talk in English- and Spanish-language medium book reading activities as she shares and discusses a storybook and a nonnarrative informational book with her emergent bilingual preschool students. The study is guided by the following research questions: (1) How are teachers’ instructional and discourse practices functional for interacting across different genres and in different languages? (a) What is the nature of teachers’ instructional practices across different genres and languages? (b) What discourse features are reflected in teachers’ extratextual talk across different genres of text and in different languages?

Four read alouds, in which a teacher read 1 English narrative book, 1 English informational book, 1 Spanish narrative book, and 1 Spanish informational book, were videotaped and transcribed. The teacher, Ms. C, is a native Spanish-speaking Latina female who is bilingual in English and Spanish. Using a systemic functional linguistic framework, data were coded for the academic discourse features in Ms. C’s extratextual
speech and analyzed to examine how Ms. C’s language was functional for bridging the academic discourse of storybooks and informational texts in English and Spanish.

In terms of Ms. C’s discourse features, findings of the study reveal that book genre determined the organization of Ms. C’s message, the role that she assumes in the read aloud, and the knowledge and content that she navigates for children in her speech. With regards to Ms. C’s instructional practices, the language of the book/instruction determined differences in the vocabulary, narrative, nonnarrative, and print knowledge targets that Ms. C discusses, the instructional strategies that she uses, and the translanguaging practices that she implements to navigate the text for children.

The results of this study inform the field with regard to ways in which teachers apprentice children in different genre-specific registers of academic discourse at the initial stages of schooling. These findings are unique to those already documented in the field since little research describes teachers’ genre- and language-specific instructional practices across narrative and informational texts in bilingual preschool classrooms. Several important implications are suggested for teachers’ instructional practices around narrative and informational texts in Spanish and English target languages.
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CHAPTER ONE: ACADEMIC DISCOURSE FOR EMERGENT BILINGUAL STUDENTS

Introduction

Proficiency in academic language has been identified as one of the key factors contributing to the large achievement gap between students who perform well and those who do not in U.S. schools (Wong-Fillmore, 2004). Academic language is defined as the lexical, grammatical, and discourse features of written and oral language used in instructional or text-based interactions within the content areas (Bailey & Butler, 2003). Similar to Alvarez’s (2012) expansion of the academic language term, I use the term academic discourse to account for the varying functions and uses of academic language across different genres of text. For those students who are not provided with sufficient support to learn and interact using academic language, many of whom are emergent bilinguals, content-area knowledge acquisition becomes increasingly difficult because they are still in the process of acquiring grade-level academic English (Francis, Rivera, Lesaux, Kieffer, & Rivera, 2006; Scarcella, 2003; Schleppegrell, 2004). This issue is ever-pressing given the yearly increase of emergent bilinguals and other culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) students in the U.S. over the last half decade. Currently, at least 45% of the public school student body is comprised of such students, and 21% of PreK-12 students speak a language other than English (Aud, Hussar, Planty, Snyder, Bianco, Fox, Frohlich, Kemp, & Drake, 2010). Moreover, as children progress through the grades, the language and literacy demands within the content areas increase, making

1 The term emergent bilingual is being used to refer to an individual who has varying levels of proficiency in one or more languages and who has the potential to learn another language because of their exposure to environments where have opportunities to hear and practice each language.
it more difficult for emergent bilingual students to catch up with English-speaking peers (Townsend, 2009). Policy makers in the current assessment-centered educational environment have placed additional pressures for emergent bilingual students to acquire academic English language skills in a short amount of time. High-stakes assessments, which often determine students’ promotion or graduation, are administered in English – a language that emergent bilingual students are still in the process of learning – and require knowledge of academic language features (Hayes, Rueda, & Chilton, 2009).

The acquisition of academic discourse is challenging for students since it represents a number of registers, each of which comprise complex linguistic features, and which are organized in different manners according to their function (Brown, 2007; Ferguson, 1994). As well as recognizing the different features of each genre, with time, students are expected to produce texts for socially-mediated purposes that are reflective of the various literary genres and their respective structures (Christie, 2012; Schleppegrell, 2004). This knowledge represents the initial steps of students’ academic discourse development upon which their school achievement depends (Bailey, 2007; Shatz & Wilkinson, 2010). In order to meet the needs of this increasingly diverse student population, teachers should be intentional and systematic in their instruction around the linguistic features of various academic language registers in an effort to support children’s acquisition of academic discourse (Delpit, 2001). For emergent bilingual students who have not been provided with explicit instruction around the features of academic English discourse, their performance in school is usually poor since these structures are not evident to emergent bilingual students (Cummins, 2000) and they have not been given the tools or opportunities to gain access to mainstream education (Mays,
2008). Such skills mediate students’ ability to fully participate in classroom activities since their engagement and comprehension are contingent upon their ability to think and express themselves through academic registers (Hayes et al., 2009; Shatz & Wilkinson, 2010; Zwiers, 2004). Moreover, academic language proficiency is necessary for students’ success in contexts outside of school since individuals’ competent participation in economic, social, and practical areas, and their future access to good and services in society (Delpit, 2001), require knowledge of such uses of language (Moore, Bean, Birdyshaw, & Rycik, 1999).

The mismatch between linguistically diverse students’ discourse patterns and those of the dominant society have a direct impact on these students’ educational outcomes (Nieto, 1998). Academic discourses and the culture of school are often more familiar to and are more skillfully navigated by white, middle class, native English-speaking students (Mays, 2008) than emergent bilingual students who, while less experienced with such registers (Scarcella, 2003; Schleppegrell, 2004), also bring a diverse range of linguistic, cognitive, and cultural discourse patterns acquired from home (Gee, 1990). For most emergent bilingual students who speak another language at home, school can represent one of the few contexts where they might encounter academic English through content areas texts and formal language from teachers who model and scaffold these registers of schooling (Gutiérrez, 1995). However, students’ academic discourse can only develop when teachers are thoughtful and cognizant of students’ varied discourse patterns (Aukerman, 2007), the important connection between academic language skills and school success (Scarcella, 2003), and the necessity of explicit academic language instruction and opportunities for students to practice these skills.
Emergent bilingual students are able to engage in schooling and literacy instruction when they are provided with experience, knowledge, and resources to acquire academic language at the early stages of their education (Danzak & Silliman, 2005).

**Background and Statement of the Problem**

Although specific recommendations have been outlined in the literature, research continues to document the lack of teachers’ awareness of the need to highlight academic language, including cross-discipline and discipline-specific linguistic structures and rhetorical patterns for emergent bilingual students (Fillmore & Snow, 2000). Since the language of school is often “hidden” (Christie, 1986) to students who have not been socialized into such dominant discourses (Delpit, 2001), rigorous, equitable educational opportunities will only be provided for emergent bilingual students when teachers are able to expose these otherwise implicit features of academic discourse (Christie, 1986). Teachers have a responsibility to create academic discourse-rich environments for these students, and provide opportunities for them to hear and use academic language (Gutiérrez, 1995) since many may not have access to highly literate peers, adults, or environments outside of school in English (August & Shanahan, 2006; Bailey, 2007; Hayes et al, 2009; Scardella, 2003). Teachers’ instructional practices and conversations are important determining factors in whether students have access to these properties and are provided with opportunities for academic discourse development (Gibbons, 2002). Instructional conversations that involve language modeling, questioning, and sharing of ideas and knowledge are central to the teaching and learning process and offer a critical form of assistance to learners (Tharp, 1994). If certain linguistic skills are required for students to showcase their knowledge across different genres and disciplines, then
teachers need to ensure that they model as well as explicitly teach aspects of academic discourse in deliberate and systematic ways. The consequence of not doing so results in academic difficulty since students are being required to demonstrate knowledge that they have not been overtly taught (Macedo, 1994).

**Book-Sharing Activities**

Book-sharing activities provide an ideal context for the development of children’s academic language and literacy skills (De Temple, 2001) through teachers’ responsive and supportive instructional practices (Price, Bradley, & Smith, 2012). In interactive book-sharing activities, room for student-text-teacher discourse (Smolkin & Donovan, 2001) is created when a teacher reads narrative or expository texts to a group of students (Wiesendanger, 2001) and poses questions that serve to promote discussion and enhance text comprehension (Barrentine, 1996). Exposure to shared readings and participation in the book-based conversations are important aspects that support emergent bilingual students’ development of oral language and early literacy skills needed for later academic and literacy success (Sankaranarayanan, 2003; Sénéchal, LeFevre, Hudson, & Lawson, 1996; Uchikoshi, 2006). During these discussions, teachers ask literal and inferential questions, encourage students to share their related experiences, and connect text information with book illustrations (Klesius & Griffith, 1996). Teachers can help to expand and extend students’ language and literacy abilities through such extratextual talk\(^2\) (Price et al, 2012) by modeling the registers used in academic book-based discussions (Alvarez, 2012), encouraging the practice of such language forms through conversational exchanges (Swain, 1997), and being responsive to students’ linguistic abilities.

\(^2\) Extratextual talk is defined as “talk outside the reading of the text” (Price et al., 2012, pg. 426).
needs (Price et al., 2012). The intensely social nature of these literacy events provides an ideal context in which to expose bilingual students to authentic genres of literature and engage them in dialogue around these texts (Ciechanowski, 2012).

**Genre-Specific Features**

In order to be successful participants in learning activities, students are expected to recognize that language is structured and organized differently according to the purposes it serves within different genres and disciplines (Kamberelis, 1999). Even at the earliest stages of schooling, differences in structure, design, layout, written text, and purpose between fiction and informational books can be highlighted for preschoolers (Torr & Clugston, 1999) in support of their understanding that written forms, or genres, convey meaning differently within specific cultural contexts (Schleppegrell, 2004). Genres are defined within a conventional classification system that categorizes types of texts according their structure and content (Devitt, 2004; Donovan & Smolkin, 2002). The most commonly-examined genres for preschool children in the monolingual English research literature are traditional narrative and informational texts (Pappas, 1991; Torr & Clugston, 1999), which are distinguished by a set of discrete characteristics. For example, the events in narrative picture books follow a sequence from orientation and complication to crisis and resolution with a focus on individual characters’ growth and conflict as way to explore certain themes or issues represented in the book. Past tense verbs are often used to describe characters’ actions, feelings, thoughts, and expressions and the illustrations offer an extension of these attributes, helping to support and enhance the meanings of the written text. In contrast, informational books are often structured
according to their classification of phenomena and usually create generalizations in order to justify these taxonomies. The present tense is most often used to describe these facts and knowledge, along with technical terminology, analogies, and comparisons in order to compare, contrast, and describe features of the phenomena (Pappas, 1991; Torr & Clugston, 1999).

**Genre-specific features in different languages.** Cross-linguistic genre comparison represents an interesting area of research that has not yet been extensively investigated. What is currently known about the structure and content of different genres has been derived from the linguistic analysis of monolingual English texts. While this certainly provides a foundation for knowing more about the structure of narrative and informational books in different languages, research has documented integral differences in the syntactical and textual makeup of each language, especially when attempting to establish semantic equivalence across codes (De Beaugrande, 1980; Jaszczolt, 2003; Krzeszowski, 1990; Nida, 1964). This suggests that similar genres across languages may contain language-specific features and structures, especially when considering that the organization of language is created to reflect the social environment and social purposes for language (Halliday & Hasan, 1985). Since meaning is often culture-bound, differences in text structures and style may be necessary in order to create a similar reading experiences across languages (De Beaugrande, 1980). Additional research in this area can shed further light on the interplay between language and distinctive textual features, and how teachers attend to these features in their book-based extratextual talk with emergent bilingual preschoolers in dual-language contexts in support of their engagement with academic language.
Instruction of genre-specific features. Book-sharing activities are valuable because they can be used to expose students to different genres of text. Different genres place distinct demands on students in that each discipline and genre produces and represents knowledge uniquely according to long-established traditions and does so through different linguistic features and structures (Schleppegrell, 2004). Meanings and purposes of narrative books are encoded differently than those of information books (Halliday, 1985) as evidenced by cross-discipline and cross-genre differences in written registers, properties and patterns of text, lexicogrammatical features, and text structure, organization, design and layout (Pappas, 1991). As such, there are differences in the discursive properties of extratextual talk occurring in book-sharing activities with different genres of books (Bradley & Jones, 2007; Moschovaki & Meadows, 2005b; Pappas, 1993; Pellegrini, Perlmutter, Galda, & Brody, 1990; Torr & Clugston, 1999). In the context of book-based interactions, teachers can support students’ academic discourse development by explicitly teaching important vocabulary and grammatical structures as they emerge in texts (Peercy, 2011), calling students’ attention to how different genres build and present information (Fang, Schleppegrell, & Cox, 2006), exposing students to books with different academic registers, translating and interpreting the academic registers of these texts, and engaging students in cross-genre reading and discussion (Alvarez, 2012). Thus, book-based interactions present ideal opportunities for teachers to focus on academic language-related aspects within and across book genres, especially since instruction on form and structure is more appropriate when grounded in authentic texts and is made more meaningful through the interactive, social context of the book-sharing activities (Schleppegrell, Achugar, & Oteiza, 2004).
Apprenticeship

Sociocultural theories of apprenticeship (Rogoff, 1990) and scaffolding (Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976) provide relevant lenses in which to examine how teachers might provide students with guided practice in appropriating academic language through the shared reading of different genres of books. Apprenticeship is defined as the active learning of children who, through observation and participation, are guided by a more skilled and knowledgeable partner in a sociocultural activity. Although apprenticeship is a collaborative process between children and their mentors, it entails responsibility from the mentor to identify and build bridges between children’s current understanding and a more advanced level of skill and knowledge. Moreover, it requires the mentor to organize activities through which they can guide children in the appropriation of knowledge that will result in children’s adoption of increasingly skilled roles (Rogoff, 1990).

While an apprentice is characterized as an active learner, responsible for engaging in and making sense of learning situations, the mentor is accountable for structuring a child’s involvement in the activity, regulating the difficulty of tasks, and assisting them in accomplishing the task (Rogoff, 1990). A mentor can create these supportive situations through identifying the apprentice’s zone of proximal development (ZPD), or, the learner’s level of potential development when offered support (Vygotsky, 1978). This support is provided in the form of scaffolding, whereby the mentor controls the skills and knowledge imparted to the child based upon what the mentor has identified as the child’s actual developmental level (Vygotsky, 1978) and the child’s range of competence (Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976). Scaffolding can represent the mentor’s efforts to secure the learner’s interest in the task-at-hand, simplify the task into components that are
manageable for the learner, sustain the learner’s motivation and pursuit of the task objective, identify discrepancies between the learners’ actual and expected outcome, control the risk of frustration during problem solving, and model the expected outcome (Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976). Through guided participation, the mentor is able to identify learners’ ZPD and implement scaffolding strategies within the context of socioculturally-grounded activities. Through the course of the apprenticeship, these efforts enable learners to appropriate knowledge from mentors and to become more skilled members of their society.

**Apprenticeship of academic language.** The theory of apprenticeship has been applied to the language acquisition process (Lock, 1978; Bruner, 1983) since language learning involves a learner’s active engagement and social interaction with more skilled language users who provide comprehensible language input (Krashen, 1985) and create meaningful opportunities for the learner (Swain, 1985) to practice new and increasingly more complex language structures (Krashen, 1981). In turn, the acquisition of academic language has been compared to learning a second language (Shatz & Wilkinson, 2010) since it requires similar processes of engagement, interaction, and scaffolding for participants. Others in the field have also drawn upon the theory of apprenticeship in the context of academic language teaching given the implicit nature of academic discourse and the importance of enculturating a novice into its use and function (Ciechanowska, 2012; Gee, 2001), in addition to providing explicit, scaffolded instruction (Cummins, 2000). For example, in support of children’s acquisition of academic discourse, the mentor exposes learners to authentic uses of academic language through the sociocultural activity of shared book reading involving different genres of books. The mentor uses
informal, community-based discourses as way to establish a common ground with students (Vygotsky, 1987) since this language register is most familiar to students and represents their current level of development with regards to language (Hayes et al., 2009; Rogoff, 1986; Wertsch, 1984). Through discussion involving these more informal and scaffolded formal language registers, the mentor can model and scaffold the use of academic language registers, highlight its function in texts and text-based discussions, and guide students’ engagement with new language forms (Alvarez, 2012; Bunch, 2006; Horowitz, 2007).

**Translanguaging**

Translanguaging is a term that is used to refer to the multiple discursive practices of bilinguals and which acknowledges and represents bilinguals’ hybrid language use. In contrast to early researchers in bilingualism who espoused that a bi/multilingual person would only be thus considered if they demonstrated equal knowledge, capability, and native-like control over each language (e.g., Bloomfield, 1933), translanguaging theory recognizes this definition to be unrealistic and deeply flawed. Through a translanguaging theoretical lens, users of multiple languages are seen as drawing on their diverse linguistic resources for different purposes and in different contexts, and thus, are expected to have varying knowledge of and ability in each language. Moreover, those who are bi/multilingual use each language in specific ways for particular purposes in order to interact and “make sense of their bilingual worlds” (Garcia, 2009, p.45). As such, their translanguaging practices comprise of both the productive and receptive uses of their languages beyond simply codeswitching (Gutierrez, Baquedano-López, &
Alvarez, 2001). By using translanguaging as a theoretical lens in which to analyze and make sense of the data, I base my study on the assumption that dual language users rely on their multiple languages as tools to help them engage with and be inclusive of other dual language users and as a way in which to support their comprehension (e.g., Orellana, Reynolds, Dornerm, & Meza, 2003; Valdés, 2002). In particular, this theoretical lens will support my analysis of the ways in which the bilingual teacher navigates different genres of texts in English and Spanish for children.

**Systemic Functional Linguistics**

Systemic functional linguistics (SFL) provides a framework through which to analyze and interpret teachers’ instructional practices as related to students’ engagement in teacher-guided, book-based interactions (Christie, 2012). Since language is the way in which meaning and information is conveyed (Gee, 2001), a close investigation of the linguistic structures used in teachers’ instructional practices during book-sharing activities can inform the ways in which teachers scaffold and apprentice students in the academic discourses represented within and across different genres of books. SFL, the study of language as a socially semiotic system, rests on several assumptions, including the notions that language plays an integral role in social interaction and serves various functions (Christie, 2012). These ideas foreground a central SFL tenet that a relationship exists between the social context and the functional organization of language use in that environment (Halliday & Hasan, 1989). Thus, the purpose of different classroom activities shapes teachers’ and students’ language use, which when analyzed at a linguistic level, shows evidence of being organized in divergent ways in order to serve the function of that activity. An analysis of the three metafunctions underlying
participants’ language use, which include the experience the speaker is relaying (ideational), the relationship of the speaker to the listener (interpersonal), and the organization of the speaker’s message (textual), reveals the inner workings of how speakers adapt language according to its function and use. More specifically, the application of functional grammar (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004) within these metafunctions, whereby processes, participants, circumstances, referents, and other linguistic categorizations are identified, serves to further expose the linguistic organization of the language.

Systemic functional linguistic analysis of book genres. Fundamental to a linguistic examination of teachers’ book-based extratextual talk is an analysis of the structures represented in the focal books from which Ms. C is reading and discussing during shared-book readings. Characterizing book-based features helps to contextualize and ground book-related discussions since the purpose and related structure of the focal books will set the stage for the function and organization of talk around these books (see, for example, Pappas, 1991). Most research within this domain has primarily focused on narrative and/or informational books, given that they represent the genres of books that are most commonly read in preschool classrooms.3 However, in examining the global elements and structures of narrative and informational books, Donovan & Smolkin (2002) recognize more nuanced distinctions within these two genres. Working from Kress’s (1994) social semiotic framework, they view the purpose of the text as driving its structure within a particular social context (Donovan & Smolkin, 2002). That is, the way in which a writer organizes text represents the reality s/he wishes to communicate to the

---

3 While both genres are commonly read in preschool classrooms, research has shown overwhelming evidence indicating that most read-alouds involve fiction, or storybooks, rather than nonfiction, or informational, books (Hoffman, Roser, & Battle, 1993; Jacobs, Morrison, & Swinyard, 2000).
reader. Organization of text (at the macro level) shares a direct relationship with its intended meaning and purpose, similar to the organization of a sentence (at the micro level) in connection to its intended meaning (Kress, 1994). Thus, through an analysis of linguistic features (e.g., cohesion, tense, vocabulary, and syntax), global elements (e.g., setting, initiating event, conflict, and resolution), and global structures (e.g., how linguistic features and global elements are hierarchically linked in text content), Donovan & Smolkin (2002) identified four distinct genres of books: story, non-narrative information, narrative information, and dual purpose books. Applying this approach to identifying the underlying structures within and across the different book genres that teachers read will help ground an SFL analysis of teachers’ extratextual talk in support of children’s engagement with such books.

The Mode Continuum

When using SFL to analyze both teachers’ speech and the text of books, an important aspect to consider is the differences in linguistic features that emerge as a function of each medium of language. This distinction is related to the *mode of discourse* which is one of three variables, along with the *field* and *tenor of discourse*, that characterizes the linguistic differences between registers. Registers vary according to the nature of the social activity that participants are engaged in (field of discourse), the relationships between these participants (tenor of discourse), and the role that language plays in the situation (mode of discourse). Thus, the role of language changes based on whether it is spoken or written and whether it accompanies or supports participants’ action in a social activity (Christie, 2000). While mode has generally been defined
dichotomously in the literature as the distinction between spoken and written language (Butt, Fahey, Feez, Spinks, & Yallop, 2000; Derewianka, 1990; Eggins, 1994), Gibbons (2006) characterizes mode as existing on a continuum, in recognition that not all spoken or written language share the same characteristics and purposes. As such, some forms of spoken language more closely approximate the features of informal written language while other varieties of spoken language are more comparable to formal, academic language registers (Martin, 1984).

Although research points to the distinct linguistic differences between spoken and written language (Eggins, 1994; Gibbons, 2006), there has been shown to be much more variation found between the characteristics of conversational language versus academic texts than when comparing other oral registers and written texts. For example, conversational language uses colloquial vocabulary, allows for non-standard grammar, is characterized as lexically sparse, comprises more personal involvement and interactive features, and requires less explicitness on the part of the speaker. In contrast, academic written text leaves little room for interaction or personal involvement, requires high levels of explicitness, is lexically dense and has a monologic organization that uses more formal, specific, or nuanced vocabulary (Biber, 1986; Eggins, 1994).

Written academic texts and school-based discourses, while still representative of different modes of language, offer much less variation than when comparing the linguistic features of conversation and academic writing. Inclusive of more “written-like” discourse features (Derewianka, 1990), instructional speech represents a midway point between conversational language and academic written text as it tends to be more formal, abstract, lexically dense, and structured than face-to-face, everyday conversational
interactions that take place in non-academic contexts. In particular, a responsive teacher will use an academic register to model the academic language of the text while helping to make the language and content of the book comprehensible to children (Gibbons, 2006). Thus, a SFL framework is useful in capturing both the teacher’s academic “written-like” discourse and the academic language of the text, facilitating a comparison of linguistic features that help identify the ways in which teachers navigate the text for students.

**Significance of the Study**

Studies have started to explore students’ development of and teachers’ practices around academic discourse in middle and secondary school contexts (e.g., Gottlieb, Katz, & Ernst-Slavit, 2009; Hinchman & Zalewski, 1996; Lee, 1995; Moje, 2000; Schleppegrell & Colombi, 2002; Schleppegrell, 2004; Valdés, 2004; Zwiers, 2008), with noted emphasis on emergent bilingual students and their academic language and literacy development in the content areas (e.g., Bailey, 2007; Bunch, 2009; Cummins, 2000; Scarcella, 2003). The rising number of emergent bilinguals in U.S. K-12 public schools has likely influenced the new direction that this research has taken, fueled by the question of how to best serve the educational needs of this important demographic (Peercy, 2011). However, when taking a closer look at the distribution of these students across K-12 grades, data show that more than half of emergent bilingual students are in elementary school (U.S. Department of Education, 2010), and 40 percent of all emergent bilinguals are between ages 3 and 8 (Liu, Ortiz, Wilkinson, Robertson & Kushner, 2008). In some parts of the country, more than 50 percent of the preschool population comes from non-
English-speaking homes (Olsen, 2006). Moreover, Spanish is the most prevalent home language of emergent bilingual students, spoken by 75 percent of the emergent bilingual population (Planty, Hussar, Snyder, Kena, KewalRamani, Kemp, Bianco & Dinkes, 2009). As such, more research is needed on instructional practices that support the early academic language development of our youngest emergent bilinguals – i.e., preschoolers – since these initial years mark students’ first exposure to and access to support in acquiring academic discourse. This period represents a crucial time for the development of children’s academic language skills since they will serve as the foundation for the academic literacy skills that children will be expected to acquire in elementary school and beyond.

Investigations conducted in Spanish-English dual language contexts are also needed given that the majority of existing research in this area examines the development of academic English skills in monolingual English environments (Alvarez, 2012; Perez, 1994). Emergent bilingual children’s language and literacy development is more multifaceted than that of monolingual children, comprising linguistic experiences and resources that span two or more languages (Jiménez, García, & Pearson, 1996). As such, the development of emergent bilinguals’ academic language skills in English and Spanish may follow a different path and require different instructional support than that of monolingual children. Currently, there are a limited number of descriptive studies that characterize teachers’ academic language and literacy instruction with emergent bilingual students in preparation for the participation in general education classrooms (Peercy, 2011; for exceptions, see Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2008; Valdés, 2001). Research concerning educators’ academic discourse practices in support of students’ academic
English and Spanish skills will have the potential to inform early childhood educators’ current practices in dual language settings and to provide insights into how we might better support the academic language and literacy development of young emergent bilingual student populations. Such studies will help fill a current gap of knowledge in the field (McCardle, Mele-McCarthy, & Leos, 2005).

Book-sharing activities are ideal for investigating teachers’ practices in support of children’s academic discourse development because, through read aloud and book-based discussion, teachers can expose children to different genres of books and highlight characteristic linguistic structures and features. However, in reaction to the prevalence of storybook reading in preschool classrooms (Gerde & Powell, 2009; Hindman, Connor, Jewkes, & Morrison, 2008; Pentimonti, Zucker, Justice, & Kaderavek, 2010), much research has focused on teacher-child interactions around storybooks (e.g., Dickinson, De Temple, Hirschler, & Smith, 1992; Dickinson & Smith, 1994; Gerde & Powell, 2009; Hindman, et al., 2008; Martinez & Teale, 1993) but not other genres. Many of these studies present the outcomes of reading interventions which ask teachers to read in a particular manner in lieu of documenting teachers’ actual practices in natural settings (Price et al., 2012). For studies that compared across narrative and informational books in preschool settings, including Torr & Clugston (1999), Moschovaki & Meadows (2005a), Moschovaki & Meadows, (2005b), Moschovaki, Meadows, & Pellegrini (2007), Price et al. (2012), and others, several limitations compromise the ways in which the findings can inform the current gaps in the literature. For example, Torr & Clugston’s (1999) results pertaining to discourse differences across genres emerged from teacher-child dyads rather than in a natural, mixed age, preschool classroom setting where teacher practices would be
responsive to children of differing developmental levels. Studies conducted by Moschovaki and Meadows investigated teacher and child participation in book reading events with several genres but did not provide crucial information with regards to teachers’ demographic information or book attributes (e.g., number of pages, number of sentences, mean length of sentences, and vocabulary diversity), which may have had an effect on the findings of the study, or which could have been used to further contextualize the results. Although Price et al. (2012) investigated differences in teachers’ extratextual talk in shared reading across different genres, their quantitative approach did not address complexities in the nature of the differences other than comparing rates of different types of utterances. Moreover, by prescribing specific books for teachers to read, and constraining features of these books, Price et al.’s (2012) findings emerged from data that did not represent a natural preschool shared-reading context. Most studies that compare discourse or book characteristics across genres have not investigated linguistic differences in talk, with few exceptions having done so with monolingual English children in preschool and kindergarten (e.g., Pappas, 1991; Torr & Clugston, 1999). Even fewer studies have analyzed linguistic differences in talk across different genres of books in different languages. Given the aforementioned gaps in research and the limitations of several studies in the field, more research that examines the ways in which teachers bridge academic discourses across a variety of genres for emergent bilingual children in Spanish and English book-sharing activities is needed.
Purpose of this Study

This case study aims to examine the nature of a teacher’s extratextual talk during Spanish and English shared reading across storybook and nonnarrative informational genres of books. The results of this study are expected to inform the field with regard to the ways in which teachers apprentice children (Rogoff, 1990; Vygotsky, 1987) in engaging with different genre-specific registers of academic discourse at the initial stages of schooling, with a particular focus on teachers’ support of young, emergent bilingual children’s academic discourse development. This study represents a yet unexamined niche within the research area since the phenomena of study take place in the context of an additive dual-language educational context. As such, the findings are expected to describe (rather than quantify) features of a teacher’s extratextual talk that will be unique from those already documented in the field since discussions and strategies are tailored towards the diverse linguistic needs of young children who are still developing language and literacy skills in each language.

Stemming from the work of scholars who apply SFL approaches to the study of children’s language and literacy development in elementary classroom settings (Christie, 1999, 2012; Williams, 2000, 2004), this qualitative study analyzes the functional grammar of teachers’ instructional practices and extratextual talk in support of children’s emergent academic discourse development in Spanish and English. By examining the shared-book reading practices of a teacher in a dual language, mixed-age preschool classroom, I explore the interpersonal, ideational and textual features of teachers’ talk in English- and Spanish-language context book reading activities as they share and discuss
storybooks and non-narrative informational genres of books.⁴ These two genres of books are selected because each represents linguistic features, global events, and global structures of the text that are uniquely structured and which are common to the preschool classroom (Donovan & Smolkin, 2002). Analysis of these genres will provide insight into whether the function, and thus structure, of teachers’ Spanish and English extratextual talk changes according to the genre’s unique structure and teachers’ efforts to guide children through book-based interactions in the context of Spanish- and English-shared-book reading activities. To this end, the study is guided by the following research questions:

1. How are dual language preschool teachers’ instructional and discourse practices functional for interacting across different genres and in different languages?
   a) What is the nature of teachers’ instructional practices across two different genres and languages?
   b) What discourse features are reflected in teachers’ extratextual talk across two different genres of text and in two different languages?

⁴ These genre classifications are based on the work of Donovan & Smolkin (2002).
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review provides a critical examination in support of my central research question of how a teacher’s language is functional for interacting with different genres of books in different languages. In the subsequent sections, I review the literature in order to establish what has been learned about the distinctive textual properties represented in the books read by teachers in different languages as well as the language features reflected in teachers’ extratextual talk when discussing these books. Following Boote & Biele’s (2005) literature review framework, I begin with a discussion of my selection criteria for each research area, present a synthesis of the findings, and provide an overview of important variables found in the studies across these two areas. Lastly, I review the current state of the field and the areas of research that require more investigation.

Scope and Methods for Review

In order to find studies that appropriately represented the objective of this literature review, a set of inclusion criteria were established and applied to determine the eligibility of each article. Any articles that did not meet these requirements were excluded from the review. Only peer-reviewed studies, having been published in academic journals, or the results of national professional/expert panels, which featured data that were collected, analyzed, and discussed, were included. Suitable articles examined one of the following topics in the context of teacher-student shared readings: (a) textual features of narrative and/or informational books, (b) teacher academic language use during book-based interactions, and (c) teacher academic language use during shared readings with
narrative and/or informational genres of books. The literature review was inclusive of international studies where participants were learning languages other than English as a second or foreign language. Only studies of typically-developing children were included. Since this review is composed of several different areas, additional criteria for each area were slightly different.

When the focal area was found to have a developed literature on students in bilingual educational contexts (i.e., dual language or transitional bilingual educational programs), I focused primarily on this research rather than studies conducted in monolingual contexts. However, if such research was not available, I reviewed the findings of studies on emergent bilingual children and/or on monolingual children in monolingual contexts. In addition, I focused on populations in early childhood or elementary years when they were represented in the literature.

In order to locate such articles, a search was conducted on Google scholar, journal websites, electronic databases, and the reference sections of relevant studies. For articles pertaining to the research area on the distinctive textual properties of narrative and informational genres of children’s books, I searched the journal websites of Reading Research Quarterly, Research in the Teaching of English, Journal of Reading Behavior, The Reading Teacher, International Journal of Applied Linguistics, Journal of Second Language Writing, Linguistics and Education, TESOL Quarterly, Journal of Pragmatics, Language Sciences, Discourse Processes, and Journal of Literacy Research. I searched the PsycINFO, ERIC, PsycARTICLES, and EBSCO electronic databases, using the following combinations of keywords to find relevant articles: systemic functional linguistics, textual properties, genre, narrative, story, information, nonfiction,
informational picture books, narrative picture books, expository reading, book feature, genre feature, genre knowledge, genre-based approach, text analysis, genre analysis, text types, genre types, academic writing, cross-linguistic, cross-language, Spanish, English, applied contrastive studies, children’s books, generic structural potential, functional grammar, microstructure, macrostructure, lexicogrammar, global element, global structure, microlevel, macrolevel, text texture, text register, and text structure. Using these procedures, I located a total of 20 articles on the textual features of narrative and/or informational books but included only 12 of these articles after applying the set of inclusion criteria.

relevant articles: book reading, bilingual, ELL, English learners, preschool, kindergarten, elementary, read-aloud, dual language, interaction, classroom discourse, oral language, academic conversation, scaffolding, story time, shared book reading, discourse, teacher practices, academic language, academic language instruction, adult/child discourse, academic discourse, academic English, academic Spanish, language analysis, academic register, book genre, information books, informational picture books, narrative picture books, narrative books, expository, storybook, literacy, literacy practices, teacher talk, sociolinguistics, functional linguistics, systemic functional linguistics, genre, genre pedagogy, discourse analysis, English for academic purposes, Spanish for academic purposes, content-based instruction, teacher education, teaching, disciplinary register, and bilingual pedagogy. Using these procedures, I located a total of 30 articles on teacher academic language use during book-based interactions but included only 17 of these articles after applying the aforementioned set of inclusion criteria.

Synthesis of Findings

Textual and Linguistic Features of Narrative and Informational Genres

There is a well-established body of work that characterizes the textual features of different genres of children’s books written in English (Pappas, 1987, 1991, 1993, 2006; Gill, 2009; Fang et al, 2006). Fewer studies have been conducted to investigate the textual features of different genres of monolingual English children’s writing (Kamberelis, 1999; Donovan, 2001) and only a small number have examined the linguistic features of monolingual English children’s oral recounts of different genres of books (Pappas, 1987, 1991, 1993). While the literature in these two areas of study focus
on phenomena that is quite different to studies that analyze children’s books, similar linguistic analysis frameworks are used across studies in these domains given that they are designed to analyze text, whether it be in the form of children’s books, children’s writing, or children’s oral recounts. As such, researchers have approached the study of genre in similar ways in these three areas of study (i.e., texts, children’s writing, children’s narratives), analyzing and characterizing linguistic features that are found across the mediums. For this reason, my discussion of the findings in this area will be organized by the linguistic structures (e.g., microstructures, macrostructures, global elements, and other features) that research has found to be most prevalent in different genres across these mediums. While texts from different subject areas are represented, the most prevalent cross-genre or cross-discipline comparison is that between the linguistic features of typical narrative and informational genres in children’s books, children’s writing, or their narratives. In most studies, emphasis is placed on identifying linguistic structures in typical narrative and informational genres and thus, analyzing representative examples of books in each genre. Although uncommon, a few studies target the investigation of linguistic structures in atypical examples of informational books (Pappas, 2006, Gill, 2009).

Each of these studies are founded on Halliday’s systemic functional linguistic framework, and thus, focus on analyzing and classifying the microstructures and macrostructures of story and informational texts, as well as their place and function in the larger context of the text and the social environment. Microstructures are distinctive linguistic features at the lexical and syntactical levels - such as word choice, verb usage, and cohesion - utilized in distinguishing the linguistic characteristics of different genres
(Donovan, 2001; Kamberelis, 1999; Pappas, 1991). Instead, macrostructures are the global features and structures of the text – such as the initial, sequential, and final events - which are usually organized in specific ways according to the purpose, content, and thus genre, of the text (Donovan, 2001; Pappas, 1987). To a lesser extent, researchers also discussed other textual features such as the illustrations (Pappas, 2006; Gill, 2009) and the accuracy and complexity of text (Gill, 2009), albeit mostly in studies targeting informational book genres.

**Microstructures.** The microstructures that were most commonly coded and analyzed were nouns and their use as cohesive devices through coreferentiality or coclassification chains (Donovoan & Smolkin, 2002; Fang et al, 2006; Kamberelis, 1999; Pappas, 1991, 1993); verb tenses (Donovan, 2001; Donovan & Smolkin, 2002; Kamberelis, 1999; Pappas, 1991); processes (Donovan, 2001; Pappas, 1991); vocabulary (Donovan, 2001; Donovan & Smolkin, 2002; Pappas, 1993); and syntactical structures (e.g., word order and phrasing) (Donovan, 2001; Donovan & Smolkin, 2002; Kamberelis, 1999).

**Nouns.** Participants (i.e., nouns or noun phrases) are used to mark the actors and receivers of action in sentences, and to incorporate notions of individuation, agency, and technicality (Fang et al., 2006). Although simple participants and noun phrases are typically used in speech, nominal elements can become quite complex and carry much information in written text through adjectives, adverbs, -ed/-ing participles, prepositional phrases, and relative clauses that pre-modify or post-modify the focal noun (Fang et al., 2006). When analyzing the use of nouns in narrative language, Fang and colleagues (2006) found that nominal groups are introduced and referenced often within such text.
These noun phrases pack a lot of information through pre-modifying participles (e.g., the prowling tiger) and nominalizations (e.g., the dreadful meowing) which help to expand and elaborate the sentences in literary fashion, and which allow for the integration of judgment and the creation of vivid imagery in the text. Thus, narrative text is highly dense with information that helps to create the setting, events, and participants’ emotions in the story.

There is a high level of lexical density in informational books too, however, this is achieved through long, nominal groups that incorporate prepositional phrases (e.g., minerals with definite chemical structures), nominalization of action or events (e.g., the change in structure), and technical vocabulary with specialized meanings (e.g., minerals with definite chemical structures). In addition, participants seldom make reference to self or any other human agent in an effort to establish authority, with such omissions purposefully concealing the grammatical actor of sentences or phrases (Fang et al., 2006).

Coreferentiality versus coclassification is another noun-based, microstructural, linguistic feature that distinguishes narrative from informational books (Pappas, 1991, 1993). In narrative books, a character is introduced in the beginning of the book, and then the author uses certain referent items, in the form of pronouns, throughout the story to track the same character. In this way, coreferentiality is established, forming an identity chain that functions as a cohesive device throughout the text (Donovan & Smolkin, 2002; Kamberelis, 1999; Pappas, 1991, 1993). In information books, characters or objects that are introduced are not discussed differently. Rather than referring to an individual character or object, authors refer to a class or characters or objects, creating

**Verb tenses.** Verb tenses mark time in language, determine the initiation, continuation, or termination of events in the past, present, and future, and index the occurrence of actions or events as either repetitive or solitary in nature (Kamberelis, 1999). Studies have revealed a high level of concurrence in terms of the verb usage across genres. Linguistic analyses of narrative genres show that predominantly past-tense verbs are used to narrate the account of stories, and at times, present tense verbs are used to describe events that occur in “real time” (Donovan, 2001; Donovan & Smolkin, 2002; Kamberelis, 1999; Pappas, 1991). Informational texts most commonly portray information in a “how it always is” or a “timeless” fashion, and thus are comprised of mostly present-tense verbs. Occasionally, information will be presented as “how it was for a particular case,” and in these instances, a more frequent use of the past tense is found (Donovan, 2001; Donovan & Smolkin, 2002; Kamberelis, 1999; Pappas, 1991).

**Processes.** Meaning in language is also derived from the microstructural linguistic feature of process, which in the form of a verb, is used to describe different types of experiences. The main types of processes are material (actions of the text), mental (representing cognition, perception, verbalization), relational (linking or auxiliary verbs such as are, have), and existential (acknowledging existence through forms of “there are;” Christie, 2012; Halliday, 1985; Donovan, 2001). Relational processes are further broken down into those which are attributive (e.g., being), possessive (e.g., having), and identifying (i.e., naming; Christie, 2012; Halliday, 1985; Pappas, 1991). According to Donovan (2001) and based on previous studies (e.g., Kamberelis, 1999; Pappas, 1991),
relational and existential processes are more common in informational genres whereas material and mental processes are found more readily in narrative genres. However, when examining the different types of relational processes, Pappas (1991) found that attributive relational processes are more likely than others to be included in narrative genres, while the informational genre is highly dense with relational processes, and typically offer numerous examples of each type of relational process.

**Vocabulary.** There is a consensus in the literature that different types of vocabulary are found across narrative and informational genres, and agreement on the description and differences of those types of words. Narratives include vocabulary that is typically commonsense or everyday language (Donovan & Smolkin, 2002; Martin, 1997). These words are related to the intentions and reactions of characters as they react and resolve conflicts in stories (Pappas, 1993) and are more literary or descriptive in nature (e.g., she hurried past; Donovan, 2001). Informational genres features predominantly technical vocabulary (Donovan & Smolkin, 2002). These often originate from the labels of different types of animals, objects, or elements as the text describes and demonstrates their classification into groups via their various features or functions (Pappas, 1993).

**Syntactical structures.** This microstructural linguistic feature represents typical wording or phrasing found within the genre, such as the ways in which temporal connectives, logical connectives, word order, and formulaic phrases are applied in each genre (Donovan, 2001; Kamberelis, 1999). Narrative genres are more prone to be temporally organized through sequencers (e.g., and, then, next, finally) and logical connectors (e.g., although, because, however) than informational texts. This is because
the temporal organization of events and the reasoning, purpose, and consequence of events are more central to and more frequently used to propel the action of the story (Kamberelis, 1999). Other syntactical features unique to the narrative genre are the use of formulaic openings and endings (e.g., “once upon a time,” “once there was,” “happily ever after,” “the end”) and word ordering that is particularly literary in nature (e.g. “loudly came the scream;” Donovan, 2001; Donovan & Smolkin, 2002). Instead, informational genres of text feature syntax structures that vary in several ways from those of narrative texts. While informational texts do not often feature many temporal connectives or sequencers, logical connectives are commonly used to create relationships among the elements being discussed or to provide reasoning for results, processes, or characteristics of the entities (Kamberelis, 1999). Lastly, formulaic openings, such as “Amphibians are…,” are found in the section of the book where the topic is first introduced and presented (Donovan, 2001; Donovan & Smolkin, 2002).

**Macrostructures.** The most commonly coded and analyzed macrostructures in texts, children’s writing, and children’s narratives were global elements (Donovan, 2001; Donovan & Smolkin, 2002; Kamberelis, 1999; Pappas, 1986, 1987, 2006), global structures (Donovan, 2001; Donovan & Smolkin, 2002, Kamberelis, 1999), and visual features and minor text (Donovan & Smolkin, 2002; Gill, 2009; Pappas, 2006).

**Global elements.** Text structures or “chunks” that tend to recur, such as the initiating event or the conflict, are known as global elements and are properties that help to organize a text by grouping information that is related to specific parts of the story or text (Donovan, 2001; Pappas, 2006). By identifying and analyzing these properties, both the microstructural features within each structure as well as the organization of the
chunks can be analyzed in order to shed more light on the unique characteristics of global elements in narrative and informational genres (Pappas, 2006). Studies in this area, known formally as analysis of Generic Structure Potential (GSP) (Hasan, 1984, 1985), have outlined specific textual structures for narrative and informational genres. Since its initiation in the mid 1980’s with Hasan’s work, this area of research has been advanced and refined through successive studies that conduct GSP analyses in order to compare genres (e.g., Donovan, 2001; Donovan & Smolkin, 2002; Pappas, 2006) or delineate the text structures in atypical (e.g., Pappas, 2006; Gill, 2009), new (e.g., Gill, 2009), or hybrid (e.g. Donovan & Smolkin, 2002) genres.

Researchers have identified several similar text structures for narrative genres, which generally include, in this specific order, (a) the setting or placement, (b) the initiating event, (c) the sequent events, (d) the final events or consequence, and several optional categories such as the finale and the moral (Donovan & Smolkin, 2002; Hasan, 1985; Pappas, 1986; Stein & Glenn, 1979). This structure is characteristic of the sequence of typical western stories and its organization helps to highlight the actions of the main character and the temporal sequencing of events (Stein & Glenn, 1979). The structure also supports personal and interpersonal understandings and encourages inferences to be made about meanings and purposes of the story (Kamberelis, 1999).

More recent studies featuring GSP analyses of the global elements of informational texts have revealed novel structures and new arrangements of these properties, accounting for books that merge features of different genres or which convey information in new ways. Pappas’ (2006) GSP analysis of information books reveals several new elements that expand upon the GSP studies that she and others conducted.
previously (e.g., Pappas 1991, 1993; Hasan, 1985). Added to the previously-established text structures -- which included (b) topic presentation, (c) description of attributes, (d), characteristic events, (e) category comparison, (h) final summary, and (i) afterword -- were the following global elements: (a) the prelude (optional), (f) historical vignette (optional), (g) experimental idea (optional), (j) addendum (optional), (k) recapitulation (optional), and (l) illustration extension (optional; Pappas, 2006). These global elements are dissimilar to those of the narrative genre given that informational texts serve much a different function. One difference, in addition to the unique text structures, is that many of these global elements are not fixed in order, and some may be interspersed in other structures. These text structures are flexible given that the information in this genre is not necessarily restricted to following the actions of characters or a temporal sequence of events (as it is in narrative genres) (Pappas, 2006). The global elements and their flexible organization encourage a more objective stance toward the information, given that they can be rearranged to support a more effective description, comparison, categorization, and summary of the information (Kamberelis, 1999).

**Global structures.** This feature is representative of the hierarchical link between microstructural linguistic features and global elements of the text and provides a visual representation of the complexity of the content. Simple texts are those which introduce a few, unelaborated ideas while complex texts cover a large range of topics and provide much more elaboration of the ideas (Donovan, 2001). Global structures that are typically temporally sequenced are characteristic of narrative genres. Simple narrative texts describe a sequence of events with little detail or elaboration. Instead, complex narratives provide a description of the setting, which contextualizes the sequence of events in the
story, and concludes with an evaluation of these events (Donovan, 2001). Thus, the hierarchical scheme in complex narrative has many more layers than a story with a simple global structure. Informational texts that have simple global structures are those which provide a list of random facts about a focal topic. Instead, in more complex texts, facts are arranged into subtopics which are expanded upon and discussed in paragraphs and which transition to the next related subtopic on the focal subject (Donovan, 2001).

*Visual features and minor text.* Illustrations are important macrostructural features of books that contribute to the comprehensibility of the text (Levie & Lentz, 1982), scaffold children’s understanding of the story or the concepts, and, in the case of information books, serve to support and reinforce the concepts being discussed in the text (Peek, 1993). Illustrations in the informational genre vary in quality and serve different functions from those in narrative genres, especially since visual design and layout have recently been emphasized and have become the medium of choice in informational texts (Carter, 2000; Giblin, 2000; Huck, Hepler, Hickman, Kiefer, 2001). Illustrations in the information genre can include visual features in different parts of the book (sidebars, cover, title page, tables of content, margins, etc.), use different typefaces to emphasize text and meaning, and include captions to provide additional information in visually appealing ways (Gill, 2009). According to the Pappas’ (2006) analysis of illustrations and connected text, or minor text (Unsworth, 2001), there are eight categories of wording including labels, label series, captions, caption series, keys, narrative dialogue bubbles, nonnarrative dialogue bubbles, and exposition complements. These categories were unique to informational texts, with little minor text featured in narrative genres (Donovan & Smolkin, 2002).
Academic Language Features in Teachers’ Talk during Book-based Interactions

Researchers have investigated teachers’ talk for academic language features during book-based interactions with different populations and in different educational contexts. Most studies examined teachers’ talk as they read different genres of text with emergent bilingual populations in monolingual English instructional contexts (Aguirre-Muñoz, Park, Amabisca, & Boscardin, 2008; Bowers, Fitts, Quirk, & Jung, 2010; Ernst-Slavit & Mason, 2011; Hammond, 2006; Hansen-Thomas, 2009; Kieffer & Lesaux, 2012; Peercy, 2011; Richardson-Bruna, Vann, & Escudero, 2007; Spycher, 2009; Swami, 2008; Zwiers, 2006, 2007). Five studies investigated this topic with monolingual English-speaking populations (e.g., Mohan & Slater, 2006; Schleppegrell & de Oliveira, 2006; Torr & Clugston, 1999), and only two studies conducted such research with emergent bilingual populations in bilingual instructional contexts (e.g., Ciechanowski, 2012; Hayes, Rueda, & Chilton, 2009). Of the studies that focused on academic language features in teachers’ talk around informational genres of text, the majority of studies focused on science and history, rather than investigating teachers’ talk for academic language features as they read and discussed narrative genres of texts. Most studies used qualitative methodologies, and were guided by SFL. I discuss the findings related to each feature below, organized according to classification as either microstructures or macrostructures.

Microstructures. A synthesis of the findings suggests that teachers’ talk was characterized by five specific academic language features during their instruction with informational and narrative texts, four of which represented microstructural features of
language. The most popular microstructural academic language feature was the use of technical lexis. The other microstructural features, in order of most emphasis in the literature, included the use of logical connectors, processes, and participants in genres of text.

**Technical lexis.** During interactions with both informational and narrative texts, teachers explicitly highlighted technical lexis or academic terms by defining or explaining the meaning of words (Bowers et al., 2010; Mohan & Slater, 2006; Peercy, 2011; Spycher, 2009; Torr & Clugston, 1999), providing related examples or synonyms (Spycher, 2009; Peercy, 2011, Mohan & Slater, 2006; Torr & Clugston, 1999), and repeating the vocabulary to explicitly signal the importance of the words and to call attention to their use (Hammond, 2006; Hansen-Thomas, 2009; Richardson-Bruna et al, 2007, Spycher, 2009; Zwiers, 2006). Teachers who were bilingual or who acknowledged the support that students’ first language (L1) could provide in learning academic vocabulary in another language were found to implement unique instructional practices around academic language, including codeswitching (Hansen-Thomas, 2009) or highlighting cognates between English and the students’ L1 (Hayes et al., 2009; Peercy, 2011). Excluding codeswitching and cognate-referencing practices, which were only used with emergent bilingual students, no differences were found in teachers’ academic language-focused instructional practices across educational contexts and with different student populations. However, cross-genre differences in the adults’ reading of books with children were found, suggesting that informational picture books provided a context where more technical terminology was used (Torr & Clugston, 1999).
**Logical connectors.** These microstructures were found to be the second most emphasized feature in teachers’ talk, especially in studies with monolingual populations and in monolingual educational contexts. Teachers highlighted the function of logical connectors in developing thematic progression and cohesion (Aguirre-Muñoz et al., 2008; Schleppegrell & de Oliveira, 2006), constructing different types of relationships between ideas (Aguirre-Muñoz et al., 2008; Hammond, 2006; Torr & Clugston, 1999), and organizing sentences to reflect formal, academic registers of language (Zwiers, 2006). Torr & Clugston (1999) found that conjunctions such as “if” to create conditional clauses and connectors that created cause-purpose relationships between phrases were more common in informational books and in caregivers’ extratextual talk with those books than in narrative books or during interactions with narrative books.

**Processes.** Another microstructural feature present in teachers’ book related talk was that of processes, specifically in studies focusing on teachers of monolingual students in monolingual contexts and those which investigated teachers’ interactions around informational texts, which mostly represented historical texts (e.g., Ciechanowski, 2012; Schleppegrell & de Oliveira, 2006). Teachers called students’ attention to the processes, or verb usage, by identifying different types of verbs, such as action, verbal, attributive, and mental processes, and their unique functions in the text (Aguirre-Muñoz et al., 2008; Schleppegrell & de Oliveira, 2006), highlighting their lexical cohesiveness in constructing relationships between two parts of a sentence (Mohan & Slater, 2006; Schleppegrell & de Oliveira, 2006), and showcasing their usage to construct more varied sentence structures (Aguirre-Muñoz et al., 2008). However, Ciechanowski (2012) also shed light on missed instructional opportunities that could have unpacked important
meaning in history texts for students. When teachers did not explicitly highlight the type and function of different processes in the text, students did not develop nuanced understandings of how processes shape dominant discourses and portray participants in historic situations.

**Participants.** The final, most common feature that was emphasized in teachers’ book based interactions with students was the participant, or the noun group, in texts. This feature was explicitly highlighted during teachers’ instruction with both narrative genres and informational genres, specifically in history texts (e.g., Ciechanowski, 2012; Schleppegrell & de Oliveira, 2006). Teachers instructed students about ways in which to expand noun phrases (Aguirre-Muñoz et al., 2008), the referencing and summarizing capacity of expanded noun phrases (Schleppegrell & de Oliveira, 2006), structures of noun groups relevant to specific genres (Hammond, 2006), and revealed the agency, power relations, and attitudinal meanings underlying expanded noun phrases (Schleppegrell & de Oliveira, 2006). Similar to the case of processes, Ciechanowski (2012) reported that teachers’ limited knowledge of the linguistic capacity and function of participants in the history text restricted students’ ability to understand and reveal deeper meanings in the text.

**Macrostructures.** Global elements, or instruction around textual structures and properties specific to different genres of text, represented the only macrostructural feature emphasized in teachers’ book based discussions with children.

**Global elements.** The third most popular focus of teachers’ talk that reflected academic language structures across studies, after technical lexis and logical connectors, was instruction of global elements in different genres of text. While instruction of global
elements was documented in studies targeting both informational and narrative genres, these studies featured mostly bilingual students in monolingual educational contexts. Teachers instructed students about global elements by identifying and having students identify specific structures belonging to different genres (Hammond, 2006; Swami, 2008; Zwiers, 2006); highlighting grammatical features necessary for the communicative purposes and goal of the genre (Aguirre-Muñoz et al., 2008; Hammond, 2006; Swami, 2008), and pinpointing particular academic vocabulary used to discuss the structures of each genre or to be used within each structure of the genre (Hammond, 2006; Peercy, 2011; Zwiers, 2006). Metalinguistic discussions about grammatical features were characteristic of teachers’ talk around academic language structures, especially when teachers followed an SFL approach in their instruction by discussing the purpose, use, and goal of genres (Swami, 2008) or the field, tenor, and mode of language used in the genre (Aguirre-Muñoz et al., 2008).

**Other findings.** Other findings from the literature revealed several themes regarding teachers’ knowledge and practices concerning academic language. While some teachers conceived academic language instruction as encompassing only the explicit teaching of academic terms and vocabulary (Richardson-Bruna et al., 2007; Ernst-Slavit & Mason, 2011), others used predominantly informal structures of language to discuss content, and thus did not expose students to academic language during lessons (Hansen-Thomas, 2009; Ernst-Slavit & Mason, 2011; Zwiers, 2007). Instead, some teachers were found to bridge the use of informal language successfully, encouraging students to use this register in support of acquiring and using more academic terms and structures (Peercy, 2011; Zwiers, 2006). Similarly, teachers’ integration of students’ L1, either
through codeswitching or a focus on cognates, was found to be successful in helping students to learn and apply forms of academic language in classes (Ernst-Slavit & Mason, 2011; Richardson-Bruna et al., 2007).

Current Gaps in the Literature

Textual and Linguistic Features of Narrative and Informational Genres

Although several linguistic analyses exist on the micro and macrostructural features of texts, (whether it be in children’s books, children’s writing, or children’s narratives in English), there are several areas relevant to the proposed study which are under-researched. The first of these is the research domain examining the textual features of narrative and informational genres in languages other than English, or studies comparing features of narrative and informational genres in English and other languages. Given that genres are communicative, social acts whose structures are directly related to their function within a social context (Halliday & Hasan, 1985), one may assume that the same genres across languages may include unique or incongruent elements since the microstructural and macrostructural features can be structured and/or organized differently. Research shows evidence of linguistic differences in morphological, syntactical, and textual compositions across languages (Jaszczolt, 1995a, 1995b; Krzeszowski, 1990; Sajavaara, 1984), such as the incomparability of the morphemic systems in English and Spanish (Silva-Corvalan & Sanchez-Walker, 2007). For this reason, applied contrastive studies for the purposes of bilingual analysis - in this case, Spanish and English – is necessary to shed light on cross-linguistic genre similarities and differences, in both texts and extratextual book-based talk in educational contexts.
While researchers have conducted linguistic analyses on children’s narratives, little research has examined the linguistic features of teachers’ speech during interactions around reading different genres of text. Most studies tend to focus on analyzing genre in written texts rather than talk that accompanies shared book readings, and especially that of Ms. C. Moreover, this topic has not been extensively examined with monolingual or bilingual populations, or in either monolingual or bilingual contexts. Findings from the current study, targeting the investigation of distinctive textual properties of the English and Spanish books and the discourse features of teachers’ English and Spanish extratextual talk, are expected to inform this area of research.

**Teacher Academic Language Use during Book-based Interactions**

Studies in this topic revealed much about the linguistic micro- and macrostructural features that teachers highlight in their book-related interactions with students. Except for Torr & Clugston’s (1999) article, most studies examined teachers’ practices in the context of one genre or two genres, rather than comparing across a several different genres. Moreover, very few of these studies were conducted in bilingual contexts with bilingual populations, or investigated teachers’ integration of academic language features in book-based interactions with preschoolers. Since research with bilingual populations (in monolingual contexts) revealed unique language practices such as codeswitching and use of students’ L1, other unique, academic language-related instructional strategies may emerge in studies with bilingual preschoolers in bilingual educational contexts. Research in this area could inform our understanding of the ways in
which teachers strategically integrate academic language features as they navigate
different genres of text in multiple languages with emergent bilingual preschoolers.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this qualitative case study is to identify the discourse features reflected in a dual language preschool teacher’s extratextual talk during shared book reading activities in English and Spanish and to describe how teachers’ language is functional for interacting across different book genres and languages. A preliminary analysis of the linguistic features in the books read by teachers was conducted to categorize the books by genre (using Donovan & Smolkin’s [2002] framework) and to establish the types of academic discourse features that students are being exposed to across the different genres of books in English and Spanish. An SFL-informed analysis (Christie, 2012) of the academic discourse features in Ms. C’s speech provided a way in which to examine what Ms. C says in her attempts to navigate storybook and non-narrative informational texts in English and Spanish and juxtapose this with the linguistic features of the focal reading book. As well as identifying grammatical features of Ms. C’s extratextual talk, an SFL framework further supported an analysis of how such language is functional in bridging academic discourse for children across different genres and languages of books.

At the early stages of schooling, academic discourses are made accessible to children through teachers’ use of informal language that references mostly familiar or commonsense experiences. While informal, this language is already shaped by the requirements of schooling since it is being used by teachers to help children begin to understand abstract, genre-specific, literacy-related ideas (Christie, 2012). Thus, similar to Alvarez’s (2012) approach to defining academic language, and in line with Bunch’s
(2006) assertion that language is defined as “academic” when it is used to participate in academic work, I will characterize and investigate academic discourses according to the ways in which teachers communicated academic content across genres rather than solely defining academic discourses as the presence of a prescriptive set of linguistic features and structures in teachers’ speech. In order to examine how teachers’ language is functional, I investigated the textual properties of the books teachers read as well as the discourse features present in teachers’ talk around those books in English and in Spanish. The following questions guided this research:

1. How are dual language preschool teachers’ instructional and discourse practices functional for interacting across different genres and in different languages?
   a. What is the nature of teachers’ instructional practices across two different genres and languages?
   b. What discourse features are reflected in teachers’ extratextual talk across two different genres of text and in two different languages?

This chapter provides a description of the methodology of the study. I begin with an overview of the research design, explicitly discussing case study research, and continue on to describe in detail the research setting, participants, and the data collection, coding, and analysis procedures. I also discuss issues of validity and reliability, my role as a researcher, and the limitations of this proposed study.

**Research Design**

A qualitative research approach allows a researcher to examine phenomena in its natural setting and interpret that information according to the meaning, purpose, and
reality constructed by the people involved (Hiatt, 1986). The researcher has the responsibility of gathering multiple sources of data to study the phenomena from different perspectives and acting as the instrument of analysis in order to make sense of and interpret the significance of this information. Through inductive data analysis, the investigator identifies patterns and categories and moves back and forth between the data and the emerging themes so as to make explicit the complexities of participants’ meaning and reality (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). In this investigation, I used a case study approach towards the collection and analysis of data, employing the constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) and SFL to guide my coding and analysis procedures in support of my research questions.

**Overview of Case Study Research**

The goal of case study research is to cultivate a deep understanding of a single case. This strategy of inquiry is useful for the current topic of investigation given that I conducted an in-depth examination of book-based teacher talk in the context of shared-book reading activities which were gathered through a variety of data collection procedures, such as video recordings, observations, and field notes (Stake, 1995). These multiple sources of evidence helped to strengthen the study findings through triangulation and the convergence of data. Case study approaches are best applied to studies that examine contemporary, naturalistic events in real-life contexts, in which researchers have little or no influence, and which are comprised of research questions that ask “how” or “why” (Yin, 2009). These reflect the conditions of the current study in that I investigated how one teacher’s language and instructional practices were functional for navigating the
academic discourse features represented across different genres of Spanish and English language books in the context of naturally-occurring, shared book-reading activities in one dual-language preschool classroom. The findings of this study are intended to build on the existing knowledge around English and Spanish academic discourse practices during the preschool years, and have the potential to expand and inform SFL and sociocultural apprenticeship theories (Stake, 1995).

**Research Setting**

Data for this study were collected as part of a larger, multi-year research project that aimed to explore and examine the natural bilingual oral language and emerging literacy practices of children in a dual language preschool program, and the instructional practices that supported these children’s dual language development. Part of the goals of this project were to investigate the ways in which teachers and students interacted across typically-occurring, early childhood, literacy-related activities/lessons (such as circle time, story time, and pretend play) and to characterize the functions of those language and literacy practices in the development of children’s emergent literacy and bilingualism. The study took place in an additive Spanish/English DL preschool program in a multilingual and multicultural community in South Florida. The school was relatively new, having been initiated in 2007, and was working towards developing a more defined and systematized dual language approach. At the time of the study, the school’s primary goal was to expose children to authentic experiences in the two target languages of the school, Spanish and English, which were representative of the languages of the surrounding community and larger society. The school operates throughout the
year, offering a summer program that mirrors that of the academic year. The school serves approximately 130 children, from the ages of six weeks to five years old, with two-thirds of the children placed in one of four multi-age, preschool classrooms. The average size of the preschool classes is 14 students, paired with at least two preschool teachers. The children represent a variety of cultural, home language, and socioeconomic backgrounds. To meet the community’s needs, the school offers several cost options. For example, the school enrolls 25% of children from families who are able to pay full tuition, 25% of children from families who pay tuition based on an annual income scale, and 50% of children from families who receive tuition support from county, state, and federal subsidies (e.g., children who qualify for Head Start, Early Head Start, and Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten programs).

The language separation policy of the focal classroom is one in which the teacher, Ms. C speaks and models English or Spanish depending on which language was specified as the target language of the week. That is, the teacher is encouraged to model monolingual use of each target language and is discouraged from moving between, or mixing, languages.

The target language for whole group activities shifts weekly so that, depending on the week, large group activities in the preschool classrooms are conducted in either Spanish or English, with Ms. C as the model of the focal target language leading the event. While there is an assigned language of the week, there are also several times throughout the day, at Ms. C’s discretion, when activities are conducted in the other language. This approach creates a monolingual instructional language context where only one of the two language is used at a time during small and large group activities.
Although Ms. C serves as a monolingual model of each of the DL program’s target languages, she demonstrates receptive bilingual skills when interacting with students and colleagues who address her in their non-designated language. Ms. C follows her particular classroom’s language policy fairly consistently, however, children’s language use is much more flexible and generally reflects their emerging bilingual skills.

For the purposes of this study, the analysis focused on the read alouds conducted by Ms. C. This meant that during this time, Ms. C conducted read alouds in both English and Spanish depending on the target language of the week.

The data that were used for this proposed study came from the shared-reading activities collected during the 2011-2012 academic year in one preschool classroom. Shared reading was a daily morning activity in this preschool classroom which was conducted with as a large group activity with the whole class and which was usually led in the designated language of the week.

Ms. C independently chose a book to read on a topic that supported the theme children were studying or which supported an activity that was planned for later in the day. She did not often plan which book they were going to read more than a few minutes in advance of the shared book reading and usually had not recently read through the text to determine instructional strategies before leading the activity. Most of the books that were read were part of the curriculum adopted by the school, Pearson publisher’s *Opening the World of Learning™ in English and Spanish* (OWL), and thus had been read by Ms. C at least once before in previous years. Books that were not part of the
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5 This information was gathered through observation and confirmed through personal communication with the classroom teachers.
When the shared reading activity took place as a large group, children sat in the classroom’s large group area, facing inward so that each person could see each other, including Ms. C around the circle. Ms. C generally read standard-sized books, including fiction and non-fiction selections, and used the books’ illustrations to support the shared reading activities and ensuing interactions. Ms. C’s book reading practices were dialogic (e.g., Arnold, Lonigan, Whitehurst, & Epstein, 1994; Hargrave & Sénéchal, 2000) in that she asked a variety of questions, made comments, and responded to students’ comments and/or questions throughout the reading in order to elicit students’ participation and support their comprehension. The length of shared reading sessions varied depending on the length of the book and the amount questioning or discussion, but generally lasted between 20 and 30 minutes.

**Participants**

The focal participant of this case study is Ms. C, the teacher of the classroom. Ms. C was a native Spanish-speaking, Latina female who was bilingual in Spanish and English. She had served previously as the Spanish-language model teacher, but modeled and instructed in both English and Spanish during the 2011-2012 academic year. She was 30 years old at the time of data collection and had earned two associate art and science degrees in early childhood and exceptional student education from a local community college. Originally from Venezuela, she had been living in the U.S. for eight years, and had taught preschool for five of those years.
The children in the focal classroom, while not focal participants, were an important part of the context in the study of Ms. C’s instructional practices. The focal classroom included 14 children whose ages ranged from 3;1 to 5;0 at the beginning of data collection in September 2011. Eight of these children were expected to “graduate” to Kindergarten at the end of the 2011-2012 school year, while the other six children were expected to remain in the classroom for another year. Children came from homes where parents or guardians spoke Spanish (n=5), English (n=3), Spanish and English (n=4), and Turkish and English (n=2). Ten children came from Latino/a cultural backgrounds representative of countries such as Cuba, Colombia, Peru, Nicaragua, and Guatemala. Two children were European American, from families with European heritage, and two children were from Middle Eastern cultural backgrounds, specifically from Turkish origin. Based on my and other researchers’ observations of children during weekly data collection over a period of two years, half of the children showed a preference towards using English, five children alternated their use of English and Spanish, and two children preferred using Spanish during classroom events, irrespective of the target language used by teachers during focal activities. This information, however, was not verified by Ms. C. Table 3.1 provides an overview of the pertinent background information for each participating child which was collected from the demographic information provided by parents to the center.
### Table 3.1 Student background information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Home Language/s (Language/s used at home)</th>
<th>Language/s of Preference in School</th>
<th>Cultural/Ethnic Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel</td>
<td>4:7</td>
<td>Spanish, English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Latino/Colombia &amp; Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyle</td>
<td>4:3</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>North American/U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolanda</td>
<td>4:3</td>
<td>Spanish, English</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Latina/Cuba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raquel</td>
<td>4:6</td>
<td>Spanish, English</td>
<td>Spanish/English</td>
<td>Latina/Nicaragua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernesto</td>
<td>5:0</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish/English</td>
<td>Latino/Cuba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zahid</td>
<td>4:5</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish/English</td>
<td>Latino/Cuba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwight</td>
<td>4:11</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>North American/U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melany</td>
<td>4:4</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Latina/Cuba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron</td>
<td>3:3</td>
<td>Spanish, English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Latino/Cuba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erman</td>
<td>3:4</td>
<td>Turkish, English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Middle Eastern/Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akin</td>
<td>3:4</td>
<td>Turkish, English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Middle Eastern/Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>3:8</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Latino/Guatemala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>3:10</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish/English</td>
<td>Latina/Cuba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julieta</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish/English</td>
<td>Latina/Colombia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Collection

For the larger study, doctoral student research assistants conducted non-participant observations of typically-occurring preschool classroom literacy-related activities, including read alouds, in four preschool classrooms. In accordance with teachers’ schedules, each of these classrooms were videotaped and observed for approximately three hours each week to capture naturally-occurring bilingual and emergent biliteracy practices. In order to capture the activities as they would normally occur, research assistants did not interfere with the initiation, arrangement, or procedure of the activities. When filming, a camcorder and tripod remained in the background of the
classroom so as not to provide any distractions or inconveniences to children and teachers and also to capture as much of the group as possible in order to document all class interactions. Videotaping helped to minimize the number of observers (i.e., researchers) needed in the classroom to capture the information, and aided research assistants to more accurately capture emergent bi-literacy learning processes, children's engagement in literacy-related activities and tasks, as well as teacher and student language use in these activities. Moreover, data collectors took ethnographic field notes to document rich contextual and situational information that pertained to the video data (Harry & Rippey, 2008). Observation field notes and video recordings focused on systematically documenting children's participation in preschool literacy-related activities, children's and teachers' language use during these activities, and their interactions around typically-occurring language and literacy events in these preschool classroom contexts.

In total, 34 Read-aloud activities, featuring 34 different books, were documented from the focal pre-kindergarten classroom (17 English, 17 Spanish) during the 2011-2012 academic year. In addition, doctoral student research assistants photographed each page of the focal book for each shared reading activity. Most books that were read were part of the OWL curriculum, and each of these books was available in either English or Spanish. Readings featuring both the English and Spanish-translated version of the books Think Green! (¡Pensemos verde!), and Two Cool Coyotes (Los dos coyotes) are included in the video data. Books that were read outside of the OWL curriculum included The Tooth Book, Tiny Mouse, Roaring Lion, What Now, Cushie Butterfield?, Why Should I Recycle?, The Magic Schoolbus: The Electric Fieldtrip, Clifford’s Manners, Sentimientos Enojos, and Asi Me Siento Yo. Table 3.2 provides information about featured read aloud
books. Two books, *What now, Cushie Butterfield?* and *Why Should I Recycle?*, were excluded from the study because photos of the pages were missing from the collected data. The books were out of publication and were unable to be found at the school’s library or local surrounding public libraries.

Table 3. 2 Language of books

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book Title</th>
<th>Language of book</th>
<th>Part of OWL curriculum?</th>
<th>In Original language?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Little Bit More</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un Poquito Mas</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raccoon on His Own</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Cool Coyotes</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Dos Coyotes</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Click Clack Moo: Cows That Type</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar and the Cricket</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar tiene frio</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otis</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El vaquero de jengibre</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oonga Boonga</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Little Red Hen Makes A Pizza</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinito: Día y noche</td>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilberto y el viento</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Tooth Book</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiny Mouse, Roaring Lion</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>?6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Two-Promise Walk</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Quails Hit Jungle Trails</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What Now, Cushie Butterfield?</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¡Llámenme Álex!</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los vegetales feos</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El picnic de la familia Armadillo</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read More About It: Meet the Desert Animals</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La asombrosa selva</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why Should I Recycle?</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Preparation

This section is organized according to systematic procedures that were followed to prepare the data, develop the coding schemes, and code the data.

**Read aloud texts.** In order to select books that were representative of narrative and non-narrative informational genres, the text of each of the 20 books read by Ms. C during the 2011-2012 academic year was transcribed, coded, and analyzed for distinctive textual properties. A word-for-word transcription of the text was completed by the author from the photographs that were captured of each page during data collection.

**Read aloud transcripts.** The English focal read aloud videos were transcribed by the author and the Spanish focal read aloud videos were transcribed by two Spanish/English bilingual research assistants who were members of the larger research lab. The transcriptions were verified for accuracy by either the author or a Spanish/English bilingual research assistant. Before being uploaded into Atlas.ti, the transcripts were edited in order to differentiate book text (in red) from the teacher’s extratextual book-related utterances (in black) and her management-focused talk (in
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* The question mark denotes that the original language of the book, as either English or Spanish, was not able to be determined.
yellow). Any changes that Ms. C made to the text of the book while reading, such as paraphrasing, deleting words or phrases, adding words or phrases, skipping sections of the text, or vocally emphasizing words or phrases in the text, were inflected in the transcript. Table 3.3 provides a description and examples of the ways in which these and other transcription features were demarcated.

Table 3.3 Inflection/Demarcation of transcript features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcript/Transcription Features</th>
<th>Inflection/Demarcation of transcript features</th>
<th>Examples of transcript inflection/demarcation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of participant actions by transcriber</td>
<td>Description surrounded by braces</td>
<td>Ms. C: Somebody remember that we said that’s the time of the day when we whisper so we can {she mimics eating}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indecipherable words in transcript</td>
<td>Indecipherable word marked by X</td>
<td>Ms. C: Y todos los jardines lucen con X. [And all the gardens shone with X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indecipherable phrase or entire statement in transcript</td>
<td>Indecipherable phrase or statement marked by XXX</td>
<td>Ms. C: You think is in his nose? He “looked him straight in the [his]eye[s].” But the nose touches the XXX.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book text</td>
<td>Text depicted in red</td>
<td>Ms. C: “Nuestro jardín era verde oscuro y feo. Porque no sembramos flores,” volví a preguntar a mamá.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s extratextual book-related talk</td>
<td>Text left in black</td>
<td>Ms. C: Ah! Tu hermano, verdad? Se está cambiando los dientes porque ya su hermano es un poco mas grande. [Your brother, right? His teeth are changing because now your brother is little bit bigger]. So then let’s see what happened. “They come in handy in my job,” says high trapezer Mike McCobb. “If I should ever lose a tooth, I’d lose my wife. And that’s the truth.” So do you think he’s holding his wife with his… {she shows her teeth}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Management-related talk | Text depicted in yellow | Ms. C: “And camels and their drivers do!” Look at the camels and the drivers. Dwight, you were...
sitting here in this chair and you
decided to change your mind and
that’s okay but you don’t sit on top
of people. Thank you. Sit here next
to me, that’s a good idea.

Ms. C: “El vecindario estaba parado
en [todos los vecinos fueron a] la
puerta con flores en las manos.

Ms. C: {Ms. C begins to read.}
“Éstos son los nombres de los
vegetales en chino. Así yo sabré en
qué lugar está cada uno. Un día,
noté que nuestras plantas crecían.
De la tierra brotaban unos tallitos
verdes que parecían pasto. Empecé
ta gritar: ¡Nuestro jardín está
creciendo! Corrí a los jardines del
vecindario, para ver si estaban
creciendo también, pero sus plantas
parecían hojitas. Mami, ¿por qué
nuestras plantas parecen hierbas y
las de los vecinos se ven diferentes?
Le pregunté. Porque ellos
sembraron flores y nosotras,
vegetales—me contestó. —Nosotros
también podemos tener flores?—
volví a preguntar. Lo nuestro es
mucho mejor que flores—dijo ella.
“Al poco tiempo, los jardines el
jardín del vecino florecieron [por
toda la calle]. {Ms. C shows
illustrations to class.}

Ms. C: “I don’t have one! I can
[even-] **never smile** like Smiling
Sam the crocodile.”

Ms. C: “El vecindario estaba parado
en [todos los vecinos fueron a] la
puerta con flores en las manos.
Ms. C: **Esta** tan quieta como una
tortuga que toma el sol.” Mira,
estaba pensando que su sombra era
una tortuga porque estaba **muy**
quieta.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deletion of words or phrases from book</th>
<th>Text crossed out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skipped sections from book</td>
<td>Text crossed out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addition of words or phrases in book</th>
<th>Added words surrounded by brackets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrasing of book text</td>
<td>Paraphrasing surrounded by brackets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocal emphasis of words or phrases from book or in teachers’ extratextual talk</th>
<th>Bolding of words or phrases that are emphasized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Preliminary Analysis and Data Reduction

The read aloud books were coded and analyzed for distinctive textual properties in order to compare the textual features with the teacher’s extratextual talk. The transcribed text of the books was uploaded into Atlas.ti\textsuperscript{7}, a qualitative analysis software program, and was coded according to an author-created coding scheme based upon Donovan & Smolkin’s (2002) description of the characteristics of four genre categories: narrative, narrative informational, non-narrative informational, and dual purpose books. This coding scheme is shown in Table 3.4.

Table 3.4 Coding scheme for general textual features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic Levels</th>
<th>Linguistic Features</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word Level</td>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>Words related to passing of time/connectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coreferentiality (Referencing of specific characters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coclassification (focus on a general class of the topic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tense</td>
<td>Past tense</td>
<td>Real time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Timeless present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modal - Future/Subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td>Commonsense, everyday language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrase level</td>
<td>Action of characters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formulaic openings</td>
<td>(one upon a time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Literary word</td>
<td>(strange was the smell; rhyming)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>order</td>
<td>(in a land far, far away; alliteration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Literary words and</td>
<td>(Elephants are mammals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>phrases</td>
<td>(The female trapdoor spider chooses...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Storyline</td>
<td>1. Placement (description of the main characters)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{7} Atlas.ti is a software program that organizes and manages data for coding purposes, allowing the user to code and add memos and comments to the data. While a user is able to arrange codes into coding families and categories, the software program does not analyze the data in any manner, but manages the information so that is more readily accessible to the user in support of their analysis of the information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Global Elements (has a conflict, sequent events, and finale)</th>
<th>(optional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Placement (description of where the story takes place) (optional)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Initiating Event (first event or action of the story that creates a problem or conflict)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Sequent Events (events of the story in which characters work to resolve the conflict)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Final Events (conflict resolution)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Finale (how things get back to normal) (optional)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Moral (a lesson, typical in fables, is provided) (optional)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative Informatioнационаl Global Elements</th>
<th>Narrative Informatioнационаl Global Elements (relates factual events over time, recounts events of a specific case to be generalized to other cases)</th>
<th>a. Topic presentation (introduction of the topic)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. Description of attributes (description of typical events that occur)</td>
<td>c. Characteristic events (description of typical events that occur)</td>
<td>d. Category comparisons (description of two different members of the topic) (optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Final summary (recap of information presented in the book)</td>
<td>f. Afterword (presentation of additional information about the topic) (optional)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nonnarrative Informatioнационаl Global Elements</th>
<th>Nonnarrative Informatio nationalismal Global Elements (topic-oriented, reports, focus on class of topic, not a character)</th>
<th>a. Topic presentation (introduction of the topic)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. Description of attributes (description of typical events that occur)</td>
<td>c. Characteristic events (description of typical events that occur)</td>
<td>d. Category comparisons (description of two different members of the topic) (optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Final summary (recap of information presented in the book)</td>
<td>f. Afterword (presentation of additional information about the topic) (optional)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Structure Coding</th>
<th>Storyline Global Structure</th>
<th>1. → 2. → 3. → 4. → 5. → 6.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Narrative Informational Global Structure  |  a → c → e → f
Dual Purpose Global Structure (combines text types)  |  1. → 2. informational insets/diagrams/pictures → 3 informational insets/diagrams/pictures → 4 informational insets/diagrams/pictures → 5 → 6

Figures 3.1-3.4 showcase Donovan & Smolkin’s (2002) framework. This framework is based on a functional linguistic approach to language whereby genre is characterized by the structure of texts according to their unique purpose in a social context (Kress, 1994) and which is differentiated through linguistic features, global elements, and global structure (Donovan & Smolkin, 2002). Linguistic features include cohesion, tense, vocabulary, and syntax; global elements are represented through placement, initiating event, sequent events, final events, finale, and, moral; and global structure provides a visual diagram of the hierarchical relationships between the linguistic features and the global elements. Thus, the coding scheme supports the identification of genre characteristics at the word level (e.g., cohesion, tense, vocabulary), phrase level (e.g., syntax), and at the level of global elements (e.g., specific information/content that is typically included), and global structures (e.g., the relationship between the content and its organization).
Figure 3. 1 Specific features of story genre
Data Source: Taken directly from Donovan & Smolkin (2002)

Figure 3. 2 Specific features of nonnarrative informational text
Data Source: Taken directly from Donovan & Smolkin (2002)
**Specific features of narrative informational text**

**Linguistic features** (specific uses of language)
Cohesion is created in part through coclassification, the focus on a general class of the topic and not specific characters.
Tense may be present if the information provided is “how it always is” (e.g., how to conduct Experiment X) or past if the information provided is a recounting of “how it was for a particular case” (e.g., how we conducted Experiment X yesterday).
*Vocabulary* is typically technical (e.g., caudal fin, dorsal fin, pectoral fins, gills, ampullae).
*Syntax* specific to narrative informational texts includes formulaic openings (topic introductions such as “The female trapdoor spider chooses a place for her nest…”).

**Global elements** (specific information/content that is typically included; Pappas, 1986)
- **Topic presentation**—introduction of the topic
- **Description of attributes**—description of attributes of the topic or class
- **Characteristic events**—description of typical events that occur
- **Category comparisons**—description of two different members of the topic (optional)
- **Final summary**—recap of information presented in the book
- **Afterword**—presentation of additional information about the topic (optional)

**Global structure** (visual diagram of content relationships—characteristic events dominate)

```
  Topic presentation
    Sequence of characteristic events  Final summary  Afterword
```

1. First
2. Second
3. Day one
4. Day two
5. Egg
6. Caterpillar
7. Adult
8. Butterfly

Descriptive attributes or category comparisons may be presented for any of the events or subtopics covered with the events. Numbers 1–5 represent different sequences.

---

**Specific features of dual-purpose texts**

**Linguistic features** (specific uses of language)
Cohesion is created through coreferentiality (reference to the characters throughout) in the story line, and through coclassification (reference to a general class of thing) in the informational insets and diagrams.
Tense is past in the story line, present in the non-narrative informational insets and diagrams.
*Vocabulary* is a mix of technical and common sense in the story line, but primarily technical in the informational insets.
*Syntax* may include literary wordings and formulaic openings.

**Global elements** (specific information/content that is typically included)
- **Story line**
- **Informational insets**
- **Placement**
  - Topic presentation
- **Initiating event**
  - Description of attributes
- **Sequential event**
  - Characteristic events
- **Final events**
  - Category comparisons (optional)
- **Finale (optional)**
  - Final summary
- **Moral (optional)**
  - Afterword (optional)

**Global structure** (visual diagram of content relationships)

```
  Topic
    Placement
      Sequence of events  Finale  Moral
      Setting/characters
```

- **Diagrams**
- **Pictures**
- and other insets of information (e.g., Magic School Bus book reports)

---

Figure 3. 3 Specific features of narrative informational text
Data Source: Taken directly from Donovan & Smolkin (2002)

Figure 3. 4 Specific features of dual-purpose texts
Data Source: Taken directly from Donovan & Smolkin (2002)
Although Donovan & Smolkin’s framework was designed using books written in English and was created to classify such books, its application towards identifying the genres of Spanish books is still viable given that the characteristics are broad enough to be applicable across languages. After coding, books were determined to be representative of a particular genre when the majority of its word, phrase, global element, and global structural features matched the characterization of that genre as defined by Donovan & Smolkin (2002). Table 3.5 provides the results of this preliminary analysis by genre, teacher, and language.

Table 3.5 Results of the genre analysis of books by language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Book</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storybooks</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Ms. C</td>
<td>Oonga Boonga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Ms. C</td>
<td>El Picnic de la familia Armadillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>El Vaquero de Jengibre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gilberto y el Viento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Llamenme Alex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Los Dos Coyotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Los Vegetales Feos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oscar Tiene Frio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Otis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quinito Dia y Noche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Un Poquito mas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Ms. C</td>
<td>Pensemos Verde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-narrative</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Ms. C</td>
<td>The Tooth Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Ms. C</td>
<td>Asi me siento yo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cuando Tomi se Mueve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>La Asombrosa Selva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>La Granja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sentimientos Enojos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Un dia en la vida de un bombero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Purpose</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Ms. C</td>
<td>The Magic School Bus:Electric Fieldtrip</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data reduction. Based on the results of the genre analysis, I selected Ms. C’s reading of the English storybook *Oonga Boonga*, the Spanish storybook *Los vegetales feos*, the English nonnarrative informational book *The Tooth Book*, and the Spanish nonnarrative informational book *Cuando Tomi se mueve* for analysis in the study. Of the 10 Spanish-language storybooks read by Ms. C, *Los vegetales feos* was chosen as the comparative storybook to *Oonga Boonga* because each video was comparable in length, included similar amounts of extratextual talk, and both books contained repetitive language throughout the narrative. *The Tooth Book* was the only ENNI book that was read by Ms. C, and *Cuando Tomi se mueve* was chosen as a comparison text because it was a read aloud in which there was an extensive and comparable amount of extratextual talk from Ms. C. The narrative informational and dual purpose genres were intentionally excluded from this study because both a Spanish and English read aloud in these genres were not available.

Creation of Spanish and English SFL coding schemes. I created two coding schemes to identify the English and Spanish linguistic features linked to the ideational, interpersonal, and textual metafunctions of the books being read and of teacher’s extratextual utterances. The Spanish-language coding scheme was developed following the descriptions and categorizations of Lavid, Arús, & Zamorano-Mansilla’s (2010) systemic-functional account of Spanish grammatical forms as compared to those of English. Lavid et al.’s work is based upon Halliday & Matthiessen’s (1999) presentation of English SFL and seeks to provide a description of Spanish functional grammar while comparing English and Spanish with regards to structural similarities and differences. After reviewing Lavid et al.’s discussion and outline of the SFL theory as applied to
Spanish, I created a coding scheme focusing on five main linguistic features linked to the three focal metafunctions that they represented. *Process* and *Taxis* were coded in order to illustrate the relationship among phrases in the content of books and in the content of Ms. C’s talk about the book (i.e., the ideational metafunction). *Mood* and *Modality* were coded in order to depict how personal and social relationships were construed in the book’s content and enacted in Ms. C’s talk about the book (i.e., the interpersonal metafunctions). Lastly, *Theme* was coded to emphasize how cohesion and continuity were employed in book content and in teacher discourse about the book (i.e., the textual metafunctions).

Based on Halliday & Matthiessen’s (2014) SFL framework, I developed a corresponding English coding scheme that was comprised of the five main linguistic features delineated in a similar manner to those in the Spanish coding scheme. In both Halliday & Matthiessen’s and Lavid et al.’s (2010) frameworks, each linguistic feature is divided into a number of layers and sub-layers showcasing different constructions of the focal linguistic feature with examples of words and phrases that correspond to semantic nuances of its use. While my coding scheme does not offer as much complexity as the original frameworks, it provides enough depth to outline the fundamental grammatical variations in the construction of each of the five linguistic features, and to draw meaningful conclusions when comparing English and Spanish book and teacher language. While Lavid and colleagues point out various structural differences between the linguistic systems of English and Spanish, these differences do not alter the linguistic categories related to the metafunctions in the SFL approach. Rather, the structural
differences change the ways in which the categories are expressed in the two languages, demonstrated by the examples of each code.

The English and Spanish SFL coding framework (Table 3.6) were used to code both book language and teacher’s extratextual talk. As discussed in chapter two, school-related registers typically involve more “written-like” discourse (Derewianka, 1990; Eggins, 1994), in which a teacher will interact using more academic linguistic features that are more structured than the face-to-face everyday language that is common in conversations outside of the classroom. Given that my aim is to identify and compare the written genre-based features in texts and the “written-like” genre-based features present in teacher’s extratextual talk, the research provides support for my use of the same coding scheme across teacher’s speech and written texts.
Table 3. 6 Spanish/English SFL coding scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metafunction</th>
<th>Linguistic Feature</th>
<th>Sub-layer</th>
<th>Sub-layer</th>
<th>Sub-layer</th>
<th>Sub-layer</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideational</td>
<td>Taxis</td>
<td>Hypotaxis</td>
<td>Expansion</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td>Taxis_Hypo_Exp_Elab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>Causal</td>
<td>Taxis_Hypo_Exp_Enhan_Causal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manner</td>
<td>Taxis_Hypo_Exp_Enhan_Manner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spatial</td>
<td>Taxis_Hypo_Exp_Enhan_Spatial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Temporal</td>
<td>Taxis_Hypo_Exp_Enhan_Temp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td>Taxis_Hypo_Exp_Extention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Projection</td>
<td>Idea</td>
<td></td>
<td>Taxis_Hypo_Proj_Idea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Locution</td>
<td></td>
<td>Taxis_Hypo_Proj_Loc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parataxis</td>
<td>Expansion</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td>Taxis_Para_Exp_Elab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Causal</td>
<td>Taxis_Para_Exp_Enhan_Causal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manner</td>
<td>Taxis_Para_Exp_Enhan_Manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spatial</td>
<td>Taxis_Para_Exp_Enhan_Spatial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Temporal</td>
<td>Taxis_Para_Exp_Enhan_Temp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Taxis_Para_Exp_Extention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projection</td>
<td>Idea</td>
<td></td>
<td>Taxis_Para_Proj_Idea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Locution</td>
<td></td>
<td>Taxis_Para_Proj_Loc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No use of taxis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Taxis_None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Behavioral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Process_Behavioural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Process_Existential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Process_Material</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Process_Mental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Process_Relational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Process_Verbal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Modality</td>
<td>No use of modality</td>
<td>Modality_Absence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obligation</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Modality_Obligation_High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Modality_Obligation_Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Probability</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Modality_Probability_High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Modality_Probability_Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Modality_Probability_Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restriction</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Modality_Restriction_High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Modality_Restriction_Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usuality</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Modality_Usuality_High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Modality_Usuality_Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Modality_Usuality_Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willingness</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Modality_Willingness_High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Modality_Willingness_Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood</td>
<td>Demanding</td>
<td>Imperative (Command)</td>
<td>Mood_Demand_Imper_Command</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interrogative (Question)</td>
<td>Mood_Demand_Inter_Question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Giving</td>
<td>Declarative (Statement)</td>
<td>Mood_Giving_Decl_Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposal (Offer)</td>
<td>Mood_Giving_Proposal_Offer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>Marked</td>
<td>Adverbial</td>
<td>Theme_Dec_Adverbial_Marked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>Theme_Dec_Complement_Marked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prepositional</td>
<td>Theme_Dec_Prepositional_Marked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarked</td>
<td>Theme_Dec_Subject_Unmarked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>Marked</td>
<td>Theme_Imp_Marked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarked</td>
<td>Theme_Imp_Unmarked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>Marked</td>
<td>Wh-clause</td>
<td>Theme_Inter_Wh-clause_Marked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y/N clause</td>
<td>Theme_Inter_Y/N clause_Marked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarked</td>
<td>Wh-clause</td>
<td>Theme_Inter_Wh-clause_Unmarked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y/N clause</td>
<td>Theme_Inter_Y/N clause_Unmarked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-topical</td>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>Non-topical theme_Conjunc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conjunctive Adjunct</td>
<td>Non-topical theme_Conjunc Adj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuative</td>
<td>Non-topical theme_Contin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocative</td>
<td>Non-topical theme_Voc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Creation of instructional strategy and instructional target coding schemes. In order to describe and define the instructional intent behind Ms. C’s extratextual talk, I coded the instructional strategies and the instructional targets of Ms. C’s extratextual utterances. Instructional strategies are defined as the techniques used by Ms. C to facilitate students’ access to the book content outside of her reading of the text. Ms. C did this either through teacher-centered techniques that involved her providing the information to students or through student-centered techniques in which she encouraged students to produce the information. Table 3.6 below presents these categories, their definitions, and examples.

Table 3.7 Instructional strategy codes, definitions, and examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Strategy</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Teacher-centered       | IS: Clarifies/Reinforces student text-related answer | Ms. C repeats, restates, and/or clarifies the students' answer, which can be directly or indirectly related to the text, and which may be in response to a prompt for prediction or recall of information. | Gabriel: He was crying  
Ms. C: Who was crying?  
Ms. C: The name of the brother was…  
Daniel, I think. Let me see. “Then her brother, Daniel,” -Yes I was right. |
|                       | IS: Confirms predictions/recall            | Ms. C literally refers back to a child's or her own answer and confirms in her extratextual talk if the prediction/recall was correct or not. | Ms. C: The name of the brother was…  
Daniel, I think. Let me see. “Then her brother, Daniel,” -Yes I was right. |
|                       | IS: Describes illustration                | Ms. C describes the illustration.                                         | Gabriel: Look at whispering (Gabriel points to characters on the page).  
Ms. C: Yeah, that was probably Louis or Daniel. |
<p>|                       | IS: Emphasizes text                       | Ms. C emphasizes text from the book by either repeating                    | Ms. C: So let’s see. “Nobody could make |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IS: Ends</th>
<th>words or phrases, asking fill-in-the-blank questions which require children to say the key (or emphasized) word, or verbally emphasizing specific words or phrases as she reads.</th>
<th>baby Louis stop.” Nobody could.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>storybook</td>
<td>Ms. C ends the story.</td>
<td>Ms. C: “And Louise stopped crying.” And that was the? Erman: End. Ms. C: That was the end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is: Explains</td>
<td>Ms. C provides an explanation about figurative or abstract language in the book.</td>
<td>Ms. C: “Louis kept on crying until her tears ran like rivers to the sea.” (gasps) Do you think the river was a river? Or you think the mom was just, you know, saying a comparison…that it could be like that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is: Explains</td>
<td>Ms. C makes a connection for the children between the book and the children's previous knowledge and/or personal lives.</td>
<td>Ms. C: He’s missing some more teeth. Where-- We all gonna-that's going to happen to all of us. Our tooth is going to fall and then we’ll grow new ones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vocabulary</td>
<td>Ms. C states the title of the book and/or author of the book before beginning to read the book.</td>
<td>Ms. C: Oonga Boonga. The book was called Oonga Boonga and it was written by Frieda Wishinski.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS: Makes</td>
<td>Ms. C restates in her own words what occurred in the piece of text that she just read to the children.</td>
<td>Ms. C: “Louise kept on crying until her wails shook [her] pictures off the wall.” So the pictures were falling off the wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>book-to-life connection</td>
<td>Ms. C states the title of the book and/or author of the book before beginning to read the book.</td>
<td>Ms. C: Oonga Boonga. The book was called Oonga Boonga and it was written by Frieda Wishinski.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS: Reference illustration</td>
<td>Ms. C talks about an illustration in some way (e.g., referring to it), or has a conversation with a child around the illustration, without actually describing the illustration herself or commanding students to look or describe the illustration.</td>
<td>Ms. C: {to Erman} Voy a mostrar las fotos. [I will show the pictures]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS: Reviews known text information</td>
<td>Ms. C discusses aspects of the text that are known to the children/audience (based on a prior encounter/reading) before reading them in the text.</td>
<td>Ms. C: Does somebody remember what the grandma was doing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS: Segways to reading</td>
<td>Ms. C signals to children that she is preparing to go back to the text and keep reading.</td>
<td>Ms. C: Now we’re going to do the book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS: Prompts book-to-life connection</td>
<td>Ms. C encourages or asks children to make a connection between the book and the children's previous knowledge and/or personal lives.</td>
<td>Ms. C: ¿Tu alguna vez has utilizado una manguera? {Jonathan nods yes.} [Have you ever used a hose?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS: Prompts fill-in-the-blank</td>
<td>Ms. C leaves open the last word of a sentence in order to prompt children to fill in the missing word. The piece missing or the missing words are often key words (tied to the general topic of the book) that repeat in the story or phrases that are repeated in the story.</td>
<td>Ms. C: Y Tomi se imagina que su sombra son diferentes… {voice goes up, as if leading a question}—[And Tomi imagines that his shadow are different…] Student: Animales. [animals] Ms. C: Diferentes animales. [Different animals]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS: Prompts illustration descriptions</td>
<td>Ms. C literally asks or commands children to describe facets of the illustration.</td>
<td>Ms. C: ¿Qué ves que te hace pensar que se va caer? [What do you see that makes you think he will fall?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS: Prompts justification of text-related</td>
<td>Ms. C asks the child to justify her answer from a previous recall/or prediction question,</td>
<td>Ms. C: {to Jonathan} ¿Por qué? ¿Qué te hace decir que la</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Instructional targets** are a construct derived from McGinty, Pettit, Gosse, Pentimonti, & Justice’s (2011) *Explicit Language and Literacy Instruction Techniques* (ELLIT) measure and are defined as the particular language and literacy skills that are central to children’s language and literacy development and which capture the content-related focus of teachers’ extratextual talk during read alouds. For the purposes of this study, only certain aspects of McGinty et al.’s *instructional targets* were applied to the data, namely two language-related skills, *vocabulary* and *narrative*, and the literacy skill of *print knowledge*. The literacy skill of print knowledge, as defined by McGinty et al., comprises of Clay’s (1979) concepts about print, such as knowledge of the layout of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prompt Type</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IS: Prompts predictions</td>
<td>Ms. C asks children to predict what will occur in the story before reading the text that contains that information. This code is only used in cases that the reading is an initial reading.</td>
<td>Ms. C: ¿Qué va hacer la mamá con eso, los vegetales? [What will the mom do with these, the vegetables?]</td>
<td>Ms. C asks children to predict what will occur in the story before reading the text that contains that information. This code is only used in cases that the reading is an initial reading.</td>
<td>Ms. C asks children to predict what will occur in the story before reading the text that contains that information. This code is only used in cases that the reading is an initial reading.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS: Prompts recall of text</td>
<td>Ms. C asks children if they can remember what happens next in the cases of a repeated reading where children are familiar with the story.</td>
<td>Ms. C: Kyle! Do you remember the title of the book?</td>
<td>Ms. C asks children if they can remember what happens next in the cases of a repeated reading where children are familiar with the story.</td>
<td>Ms. C asks children if they can remember what happens next in the cases of a repeated reading where children are familiar with the story.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS: Prompts reference to illustration</td>
<td>Ms. C literally asks or commands children to look at the illustration.</td>
<td>Ms. C: Miren a la foto. [Look at the photo]</td>
<td>Ms. C literally asks or commands children to look at the illustration.</td>
<td>Ms. C literally asks or commands children to look at the illustration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS: Prompts vocab explanation</td>
<td>Ms. C asks children to provide an explanation of a vocabulary term in the book or clarifies or restates an explanation that a child gives about a vocabulary term.</td>
<td>Ms. C: What does that whispering mean, that we said yesterday?</td>
<td>Ms. C asks children to provide an explanation of a vocabulary term in the book or clarifies or restates an explanation that a child gives about a vocabulary term.</td>
<td>Ms. C asks children to provide an explanation of a vocabulary term in the book or clarifies or restates an explanation that a child gives about a vocabulary term.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**answer** which often looks like: "Why do you think that? or "What do you see that makes you think that?"  

manguera tiene más agua? [And why? What makes you say that the hose has more water?]
books, the print organization and directional orientation on the page, the meaning of the terms “letter” and “word”, and that print carries meaning, as well as more general concepts of literacy, such as understanding the function and meaning of the act of reading/writing and the act of referencing illustrations. The category of vocabulary represents children’s knowledge of specific lexical items and encompasses concrete nouns, abstract nouns, verbs, adjectives/adverbs, prepositions, and keywords for all vocabulary. The narrative category denotes children’s understanding of the macrostructures connected to narrative stories and includes instructional targets such as character ID/setting ID, character action/story events, and character mental state. The print knowledge category characterizes children’s understanding that print functions as a symbolic communication system with specific rules and conventions. The instructional targets that comprise the print knowledge category include book parts/vocabulary of books, print organization, letter, word, and act of reading/writing.

In order to capture the content of Ms. C’s talk when reading non-narrative informational books, I created an additional category, non-narrative, based upon Donovan & Smolkin’s (2002) characterization of the macrostructures of the non-narrative informational genre. This category served to represent children’s knowledge of non-narrative informational macrostructures and comprised of features such as topic presentation, category comparison, characteristic events, description of attributes, and final summary. During the coding process, I added an additional code to the non-narrative category called focus on narrative aspects given Ms. C’s frequent discussion of narrative features (such as those within the narrative category) when reading non-
narrative informational books. Table 3.7 below presents these categories, their definitions, and examples.

Table 3.7 Instructional target codes, definitions, and examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language / Literacy Skill</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>IT: Narrative - Character action (agent)</td>
<td>The focus is on characters’ actions. (a) what the character does (agent of action) For example: Ms. C points out a single action (that just occurred in the text) where the character is the active agent or asks the children to remember a single past event where the character is an active agent.</td>
<td>Ms. C: Who was crying?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IT: Narrative - Character action (recipient)</td>
<td>The focus is on characters’ actions. (b) what happens to the character (recipient of action). For example: Ms. C points out a single action (that just occurred in the text) where the character passive or receiving the action or asks the children to remember a single past event where the character is passive or receiving the action.</td>
<td>Ms. C: {Looking at illustration along with Jonathan.} ¿Ella se va caer? [She is going to fall?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IT: Narrative - Character ID (as participant)</td>
<td>The focus is on making children aware of: (a) characters as participants or active agents in the story (i.e., &quot;this is Eddie&quot;). A teacher can pair a pronoun with pointing to the book as a means of identifying a character (e.g., &quot;There he is!&quot; while pointing to the bear in the book) Other possible keywords: character, who, character names.</td>
<td>Ms. C: Louis was the name of the baby (she also pronounces it like the male name).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| IT: Narrative - Character ID (physicality) | The focus is on making children aware of:  
(b) physical aspects of the character ("The bear is so big"). Other possible keywords: adjectives used to describe the character. | Ms. C: She was smiling. Louise was smiling from ear to ear. |
| IT: Narrative - Character mental state | The focus is on character perceptual states (e.g., see), emotional states, desire states (e.g., want), or belief states (e.g., think or know) (Oneil, 2004). Many times character mental states are discussed while also discussing character actions, often in a causal relationship (e.g., he was sad when his mom left); these instances of teaching are always coded as character mental state. Possible keywords: character name/pronoun+want, feel, need, think, see, believe. | Ms. C: “Louise kept on crying until her wails shook [her] the pictures off the walls.” So she was crying too much. |
| IT: Narrative - Literary language | Ms. C explicitly points out, explains, discusses any type of literary language, including figurative language, idioms, metaphor, simile. | Ms. C: Louise was smiling from ear to ear. That means that her smile was very, very big that it goes from ear to ear. |
| IT: Narrative - Setting ID | The focus is on making children aware of:  
(a) The setting or setting changes  
(b) location of character, setting, or the relationship of location between characters/character-setting/settings (e.g., "Eddie is alone" or "Eddie is in the woods")  
(c) Any elements in that help support, belong to, or help create the setting. | Ms. C: Miren los gusanos. [Look at the worms]. |
<p>| IT: Narrative - Story events (causal chain) | The focus is on events of the story: questions about the temporal order of events (e.g., what happened first) or about a causal chain of actions (e.g., why did he hide?) also fall under this | Ms. C: What was the first thing that happened in the story? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IT: Narrative - Story events</td>
<td>The focus is on events of the story: comments/questions about a series of actions (2 or more) related temporally or causally. For example: Ms. C asks children to consider the temporal relations of actions (e.g., what happened first) or asks children to summarize character actions (what has happened in our story so far?).</td>
<td>Ms. C: Who’s the one that’s helping the baby after the mom?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT: Narrative - Story events</td>
<td>The focus is on events of the story: (a) comments/questions about a single action (recapping of what just happened). For example: Ms. C asks children to describe what just happened in the page s/he has read (e.g., what just happened?)</td>
<td>Ms. C: “Louise kept on crying until her wails shook [her]- pictures off the walls.” So the pictures were falling off the wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-narrative - Category Comparison</td>
<td>The focus is on comparison or description of different members of the class or topic in the book. This only occurs in books that have clear sections that discuss particular members of a category.</td>
<td>No examples from the transcripts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT: Non-narrative - Characteristic Events</td>
<td>These involve characteristic events or behaviors involving the topic. The text expresses the characteristic, habitual, or typical processes or events regarding the topic or class. For example: &quot;Honeybees travel to and from the hive;&quot; &quot;Rain falls down from the clouds;&quot; &quot;We use machines every day.&quot;</td>
<td>Ms. C: He has no teeth so he cannot…? {She is showing her teeth} Child: Eat. Child: Talk. Ms. C: Well maybe he can eat soft food. But he cannot what? Child: Talk. Ms. C: Smile they say. He cannot smile.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| IT: Non-narrative -          | Describes the attributes of the class or topic of the book.                  | Ms. C: {describing the teeth of the

target. For example: Ms. C asks children to focus on causal chains among actions (Tommy ran inside because the bear was chasing him).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Description of Attributes</strong></th>
<th>Example: &quot;Earthworms are fat and wiggly like my fingers and toes,&quot; &quot;Whales are huge sea animals,&quot; &quot;Most tunnels are long holes dug underground.&quot;</th>
<th>zebra}; Those are big ones. Big teeth.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IT: Non-narrative - Final Summary</strong></td>
<td>The focus is on providing a summary of major ideas or concepts covered in the book, and there are several characteristic ways in which this can be realized in books. Some elements are quite short and somehow tie into the title of the book.</td>
<td>Ms. C: “And never bite your dentist when he works inside your head. Your dentist is your teeth’s best friend. Bite someone else instead!” Ohh, so it’s not good to bite your dentist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IT: Non-narrative - Focus on Narrative Aspects</strong></td>
<td>Ms. C focuses on the character, setting, or story events in the way that would be expected in a narrative text, and temporarily veers away from the focal topic of the text.</td>
<td>Ms. C: “Who has teeth? Well…look around and you’ll find out who. You’ll find that red-headed uncle do.” This is red-headed uncle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IT: Non-narrative - Topic presentation</strong></td>
<td>Introduces or presents the topic of the book, which can be discrete or interspersed within the Description of Attributes (DA), Characteristic Events (CE), or Category Comparison (CC) elements.</td>
<td>No examples from the transcripts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Print Knowledge - Act of Reading/Writing</strong></td>
<td>The concept that we have to read written material; that reading and writing are something we do to glean meaning. Possible keywords: reading this story, reading this book (NOT reading as a keyword by itself); let’s read to find out.</td>
<td>Ms. C: Ahora vamos a leer el libro. [Now we’re going to read a book.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IT: Print Knowledge - Act of Referencing Illustrations</strong></td>
<td>The concept that illustrations add another layer or meaning and content to a story; that looking at the illustrations is something we do to glean additional meaning or develop a deeper understanding of the text meaning.</td>
<td>Ms. C: This one? (Teacher points to the character on the page)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Transcript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT: Print Knowledge - Facilitates language learning/understanding</td>
<td>This code will be used in conjunction with another IT code in order to show that Ms. C is teaching children about Vocabulary, Print Knowledge, Narrative aspects when also modeling the target language.</td>
<td>Ms. C: ¿Que va hacer la mamá con los vegetales, Erman? ¿Te recuerdas? [What will the mom do with the vegetables, Erman? Do you remember?] What is she going to do? No examples from the transcripts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT: Print Knowledge - Letter</td>
<td>Letters as meaningful print unit. Possible keywords - letter names, letter sounds; letter-sound correspondence; upper case/lower case; capital, alphabet.</td>
<td>No examples from the transcripts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT: Print Knowledge - Print Organization</td>
<td>That print on a page is governed by rules and punctuation and reading text is governed by rules. Possible keywords: print goes left-to-right (of print or reading); print goes top-to-bottom; punctuation words; where do I read; start reading; read left-to-right; start at top (in reference to text).</td>
<td>No examples from the transcripts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: Print Knowledge - Word</td>
<td>The concept that a word is a meaningful unit of text or to make reference to a word. Possible keywords: word (e.g., this is a word, this word says - when focused on the idea as a thing in text, not an idea like 'this is a new word'), long word/short word.</td>
<td>Ms. C: “The neighbors came to offer an…?” Who remembers the word? To offer an…?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary - Abstract Nouns</td>
<td>The explicit teaching of words that represent feelings, thoughts, etc. (non-tangible)</td>
<td>Ms. C: El apetito [es] cuando nos da hambre. [Apetite is when we are hungry]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT: Vocabulary</td>
<td>The explicit or implicit teaching of words that describe actions or things.</td>
<td>Ms. C: A newspaper boat. This is a boat made out of newspaper. Ms. C: Los vecinos son las personas que viven cerca de nosotros. [The neighbors are people that live close to us]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT: Vocabulary - Concrete Nouns</td>
<td>The explicit or implicit teaching of words that represent objects, things, place (tangible)</td>
<td>No examples from the transcripts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT: Vocabulary - Keywords for all vocab</td>
<td>Saying &quot;this word/[word] means...;&quot; &quot;we use this word/[word] to talk about;&quot; &quot;this word/[word] is something you use for...&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT: Vocabulary - Prepositions</td>
<td>The explicit teaching of words that indicate relationships between a noun and another word in the sentence (often location, direction, time, of possession [e.g., in, on, in front, after, of]).</td>
<td>Ms. C: “Allí, mamá los lavó, tomo un cuchillo enorme y empezó a picar.” [There, mom washed them, took an enormous knife and started to chop} {Makes cutting motion with hand and makes chopping sound.} A picar. [to chop]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT: Vocabulary - Verbs</td>
<td>The explicit teaching of action words</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>This code is used to identify Ms. C's extratextual talk which does not align with one of the instructional targets around features of (a) narrative, (b) nonnarrative text, (c) print knowledge, or (d) vocabulary. This often includes text-to-life connections that Ms. C tries to make with children, and which</td>
<td>Ms. C: Quien leyó el libro ayer de… ¿Quien leyó este libro connigo? [Who read the book yesterday of… Who read this book with me?]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unit of analysis: Instance of text discussion. In support of my aim to analyze the relationship between the distinctive textual properties of the books read by Ms. C and her discourse features when discussing the text, I defined my unit of analysis as any instance when the content of Ms. C’s extratextual talk referenced the content of the text that she had just read or was about to read from the book. These units of analysis, or Instances of Text Discussion, included both book language and teacher talk, facilitating my analysis of how teacher’s language was functional for navigating the elements of different genres of text in different languages. I divided the transcripts into the separate instances of text discussion which resulted in a total of 45 units of analysis: eight in the English storybook read aloud, 13 in the Spanish storybook read aloud, 15 in the English non-narrative informational read aloud, and nine in the Spanish non-narrative informational read aloud.

Coding procedures. Focusing only on teachers’ extratextual book-related talk, the next step of the coding process, microanalysis of the teacher’s discourse features, involved identifying and labeling the smallest meaningful parts of the teacher’s extratextual talk (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Using the SFL coding schemes that I had created, I coded the linguistic features of the book language and teacher’s extratextual talk for both Spanish and English storybooks and non-narrative informational books. Having identified the distinctive discourse properties of books and the discourse features in teachers’ extratextual talk, the research questions called for an analysis of the connection between the books’ discourse properties and the academic discourse features
evident in teachers’ book-related talk as they attempt to scaffold academic language for children – that is, how teachers’ language is functional for navigating the academic language structures/features found across different genres and in different languages. Subsequently, I coded Ms. C’s extratextual talk for instructional strategy to depict the ways in which Ms. C was attempting to provide children with access to the text. Codes related to the instructional target were added to identify the particular language or literacy-related skill that was the focus of each extratextual utterance. Lastly, I delineated the unit of analysis, the instances of text discussion, in preparation for the final phases of formal data analysis.

**Establishing study credibility.** A valid study is one in which the results accurately represent participants’ experiences of the phenomena being examined (Schwandt, 1997). In order to establish the credibility of this study, I applied several procedures in an effort to validate the data and the inferences I made from them, namely through procedures such as disconfirming evidence, peer debriefing, prolonged engagement in the field, thick, rich description, and researcher reflexivity. These procedures are guided by the assumptions of the constructive paradigm that I’ve adopted and by my lens towards establishing credibility (Creswell & Miller, 2000). Each of these procedures is discussed below except for researcher reflexivity, which is discussed separately in a subsequent section.

Disconfirming evidence is a method that I used to search through the data for evidence that either supports or counters the preliminary themes and categories that I first established. This process allowed me to check if the trends that I identified were substantiated by those actually occurring in the data. When reviewing each code, I
assessed the goodness-of-fit between the codes and the data, and engaged in an iterative revision process until the codes accurately captured the phenomena and were appropriate to describe the functionality of Ms. C’s extratextual talk in conjunction with book language.

The process of peer debriefing helped to challenge my assumptions and to question my rationale during coding procedures (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). To ensure that my codes were valid and reliable within and across the transcripts of different books and shared reading activities, I asked two doctoral student peers, both of whom are members of the Early Childhood Bilingualism research group in which I participate, are bilingual in Spanish and English, and have experience with qualitative research methods, to review a portion of the data so as to determine a percentage of agreement with my coding scheme, and establish acceptable inter-rater reliability. There were a total of 796 utterances across the four read aloud transcripts: 514 that originated from teachers and 282 that originated from books. I followed the code verification procedures of Girolametto, Hoaken, Weitzman, van Lieshout (2000), who verified 30% of their data, but differed from their processes by measuring my data at the utterance level rather than by time.

Given that my data were more authentically represented by text than by video length, and that my codes reflected utterances or more specific features (phrase, word, etc.), the best measure of 30% of my data was to derive 30% of the total number of utterances. Thus, one doctoral student colleague checked the SFL and instructional strategy coding of 238 utterances (30% of all utterances), approximately 154 of which were from teacher talk (reflecting 30% of teacher codes) and approximately 84 of which
were from the reading of the book (representing 30% of book codes). These utterances were not chosen sporadically across the data, but were part of 28 separate units of analysis (i.e., instances of text discussion) that were taken from different time points across the four transcripts so as to be reflective of the different phases of the read aloud activity. A second doctoral student peer reviewed the instructional target coding of 238 utterances (30% of all utterances, comprised within 28 instances of text discussion) and 14 instances of text discussion (30% of all instances of text discussion). This procedure yielded 60% agreement for SFL coding, 95% for Instructional strategy coding, 76% for Instructional target coding, 57% agreement regarding the instances of text discussion.

In preparation for doctoral student colleagues to code this portion of my data, I provided each with a document that listed the codes, their definitions, and examples as well as a document with a list of coding procedures and an explanation of each step. I convened with each separate doctoral student either through online video conferencing technology or by phone to discuss these codes, go through the examples, and practice coding a portion of the data that was not included in the current study until the doctoral student reached >90% agreement with me on that portion of the data. After this process, doctoral students were instructed to check the pre-specified codes and record any disagreements by writing an explanation for their disagreement and the noting the different way that they would have coded the data. Agreement results were obtained by using the following formula: (number of agreements/[number of agreements + disagreements]) x 100 (Girolametto et al., 2000).

After the preliminary round of code verification, the two doctoral students acted as critical friends (Schuck & Russell, 2005), and helped to question and challenge the
descriptions and delineations of codes, asking for clarifications and providing alternative interpretations of the data. This secondary review of data resulted in a revision of the boundaries of the units of analysis, increasing that number of instances of text discussion from 45 to 47, and the revision of code definitions or codes, yielding a higher percentage of overall agreement, specifically 100% agreement for SFL coding, 100% for Instructional strategy coding, 100% for Instructional target coding, 100% agreement regarding the instances of text discussion.

Prolonged engagement in the field is another important validity procedure since it increases the likelihood of gaining a credible account of the phenomena I am studying. During the two years of my engagement in data collection for the larger project from which this analysis emerged, I have had the opportunity to build trust with Ms. C and the students in her preschool classrooms and they have had the time to become comfortable with the data collection process and those involved in it. Moreover, using data that has been collected over a prolonged period of time supports a better understanding of the interactions and activities, ensures that the data captured reflect what actually occurs in the setting, and helps build a tighter and more holistic case (Creswell & Miller, 2000).

Thick, rich description is another crucial component of establishing credibility in qualitative research since it provides readers with a sense of verisimilitude, or the feeling of having experienced the events that occurred in the study for themselves. To achieve this, I have described key components of the study, such as the setting, the activities, and the participants, in great detail in support of readers’ understanding and familiarity with the research setting. In the results section, I will also provide evidence of my findings by
including excerpts of data and detailed descriptions that substantiate the resulting themes and categories.

**Analyzing the nature of Ms. C’s instructional practices.** Guided by the investigation of teacher’s instructional practices across two different genres and languages, I analyzed the teacher’s use of instructional targets and strategies across English and Spanish storybooks and nonnarrative informational books (research question 1a) through the lens of SFL. More specifically, I identified the most prevalent strategies used with each of the four instructional targets (vocabulary, narrative, nonnarrative, and print knowledge) and compared cross-linguistic differences (such as when comparing the same genre across language contexts) or genre-specific differences (such as when comparing the different genres within one language context) in target and strategy usage. Once having determined the most salient targets and strategies for each genre, I analyzed the organization of microstructural features in teachers’ speech, namely the mood, modality, process, theme, and taxis, as contextualized within the different strategies that the teacher was implementing and towards the different instructional targets, or goals, that she was orienting herself. This analysis enabled me to discuss the similarities and differences of specific strategies and targets that were shown to be salient within and across genre and languages through analysis of the underlying microstructural features in the teacher’s speech.

**Analyzing the discourse features in Ms. C’s extratextual talk.** In order to find out what discourse features are reflected in teachers’ extratextual talk across two different genres of text and in two different languages, I analyzed the microstructural features of the teacher’s speech and those of the book in *instances of text discussion*, or topically-
related units of analysis. This analysis will support my larger efforts of characterizing the functionality of the dual language preschool teacher’s instructional and discourse practices when interacting across these different read alouds. I analyzed the ways in which she navigated that book for children in terms of mood, modality, theme, process, and taxis by comparing the microstructural features of the sections of text that the teacher read out loud and the microstructural features of her extratextual talk as she discussed these excerpts. I then analyzed the patterns across the different genre and language contexts, paying careful attention to the relationship between the teacher and the text, and how she supported, moved away from, expanded upon, or focused in on particular portions of the text.

Throughout all stages of analyses, I engaged in the Constant Comparative Method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) to examine and reexamine data while comparing the emerging codes and themes to the coding schemes and findings of previous papers on similar topics (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Having coded the data for the microstructural features, I compared the ways in which these features were used in the different instructional strategies and targets or in teacher’s talk and in the text of the book within topically-related instances of text discussion and, using this method, compared these findings with similar instructional strategies and targets across genre and language contexts.

**Researcher Role**

When engaged in qualitative research, the researcher relies on her own perceptions to analyze the data, acting as the instrument of analysis through which the information is reviewed and interpreted (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Moreover, through contact with and observation of the activities, the researcher
exerts influence on the behavior of participants and the events taking place. As such, there is a range of strategic, ethical, and personal issues in the process of qualitative research that need to be explicitly addressed to protect the validity of the study (Locke, Spirduso, & Silverman, 1993). By discussing the influences that my point of view, belief systems, and personal purposes may have on the outcome, I can develop well-informed subjectivity (Peshkin, 1988) through acknowledgement of these effects rather than attempt to ignore or conceal them. Since any mode of inquiry is not free from the values or perspectives of those interpreting the information, discussing these explicitly helps strengthen the qualitative research.

My interest in studying teachers’ bilingual instructional practices is related to the assumptions that I make about the language and literacy learning process. Those assumptions are that preschool exists as an important time period for children to build skills in two languages that will become the foundation for future biliteracy skills. Teachers play an important role since they help guide children in the learning process by modeling and exposing them to relevant language structures that help them meet different purposes. Although children have opportunities outside of school to speak with others and to be exposed to different varieties of language, their time spent in the preschool classroom affords them the unique opportunity to hear and learn language in the context of academic activities.

I recognize that, while informed by research, these assumptions also stem from my own language learning experiences as a simultaneous Italian-English bilingual child and now, a multilingual adult with varying levels of proficiency in 5 languages. Having developed metalinguistic awareness through experiences with multiple languages, I
realize how often I rely on my general knowledge of language structures to support my continued language learning, as well as learning in other areas of life, such as in academia. I am able to decipher and comprehend academic texts and identify implicit differences in language structures across genres using my knowledge of cognates and morpho-syntactical structures. In this way, my own language experiences provide the motivation and drive for my interest in and advocacy of this topic of study.

I acknowledge, however, that my language learning experiences are very different than those of many teachers and children in the study, as I have always been in a position of privilege as a White woman with native language proficiency (Sleeter, 2001) in the language with the most social, political, and academic power of the countries, South Africa and the United States, in which I’ve lived. The languages that I have learned in addition to English (e.g., Afrikaans, Zulu, French, and Italian) were not devalued or looked upon as a threat in school or at home given my English language proficiency. Moreover, as a simultaneous bilingual learner from a middle class background, these additional languages were seen as helping me become a more well-rounded, international person by my family, teachers, and surrounding community. Thus, my experiences with bilingualism and multilingualism don’t necessarily help me to identify with or understand the language learning experiences of Ms. C and students in this study who have not always had proficiency in English and whose home languages have been devalued by the larger society.

In an attempt to delineate the influences of my role and identity as researcher in this study, I am guided by the technical considerations outlined by Patton (1990). In terms of *participantness*, my role during the data collection was that of a complete
observer who did not participate in the activities that I observed. Teachers and children did not generally acknowledge my presence during data collection (as was preferred in the capture of naturalistic data) other than during the first few weeks of my observations in the classrooms. My positioning at the side of the classroom when filming and observing the interactions helped support this. According to Patton’s aspect of revealedness, my stance as the researcher collecting data was to be truthful about the purposes of the study, but to be vague about specific analyses that would emerge from the research. Teachers were told that the study was being conducted to investigate children’s bilingual and biliteracy development and teachers’ practices in support of this learning. Teachers were informed that this study was not intended to evaluate their instructional practices and the data would not be used for programmatic decisions of any kind. This information helped encourage teachers to maintain their natural role and to continue teaching in the same manner as if their interactions and activities were not being filmed.

The intensiveness, or the degree of time spent at the study site, was fixed throughout the data collection period, which continues today. A data collection schedule was designed around Ms. C’s schedules and was adhered to weekly for the duration of each academic year. Teachers expected researchers to film on the same day each week, and to be in the class for approximately three hours in the morning. The extensiveness, or the length of time spent at the study site, supported my efforts in establishing a trustful and friendly relationship with teachers. In total, researchers were engaged in studying the classrooms for a period of two years and three months, of which I was involved two years. To support the formation of a relationship with Ms. C and to make sure that the children became familiar with the researcher collecting data, each of three researchers
involved in data collection was assigned to the same classroom over one academic year. I built a relationship with teachers through informal conversations before and after class activities and by discussing common interests, classroom tasks, and children’s behavior. Over a period of two years, I became a familiar face in the classroom and seemed to be welcomed by teachers and children into their classroom.
CHAPTER FOUR: THE NATURE OF ONE DUAL LANGUAGE TEACHER’S INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES ACROSS STORYBOOK AND NONNARRATIVE INFORMATIONAL GENRES IN SPANISH AND ENGLISH

In this chapter, I present the findings on the nature of the teacher’s instructional practices across English storybook (ES), Spanish storybook (SS), English nonnarrative informational book (ENNI), and Spanish nonnarrative informational book (SNNI) genres. I provide a description of the discourse features in Ms. C’s speech and an analysis of the similarities and differences in the focal strategies and targets that she implemented in English and Spanish storybook read alouds and in English and Spanish informational book read alouds. I begin the chapter by presenting a descriptive summary of the discourse features in the instructional strategies and targets used by Ms. C across the genre and language read alouds. In the subsequent section, I discuss the most prevalent trends with regard to the teacher’s use of instructional strategies and targets and provide a deeper linguistic analysis of the discourse features behind the most prominent instructional practices for each genre and language context.

Teacher’s Discourse in Instructional Strategies and Targets: Descriptive Summary

Modals

Modality is a way in which a speaker can temper or qualify her message as well as communicate attitudes or judgment about that message. For example, rather than portray a statement as being absolute (i.e., either absolutely true or absolutely false), the use of modals or adverbs allows a speaker to indicate the relative, variable, or probable nature of a message. There are five different ways in which modality is expressed,
namely through modals of probability (e.g., must, may, might, definitely, perhaps, possibly), usuality (e.g., always, usually, sometimes, typically, rarely, will), obligation (e.g., must, will, supposed to, expected to, may, allowed to), inclination (e.g., will, determined to, keen to, willing to, won’t), and capability (e.g., can, does, is able, is capable, cannot, doesn’t). These modals and adverbs are integrated in order to intimate different degrees of nuance in the communication of messages (Eggins & Slade, 1997).

Ms. C used a range of different modals in ES and ENNI genres. In the ES genre, she used probability and obligation modals when explaining abstract nouns, describing illustrations, and clarifying/reinforcing student text-related answers around character ID. In the ENNI genre, Ms. C used obligation, probability, and restriction modals when recapping characteristic events and prompting book-to-life connections around characteristic events. There were much fewer modals used by Ms. C in SS and SNNI genres.

**Mood**

Mood refers to different patterns of clauses that have unique functions in conversational exchanges depending on the structural configuration of the phrase. Declarative clauses, or statements, usually present information for negotiation and frame a speaker as active and taking initiative. Interrogative clauses, or questions can either be polar in nature (i.e., yes/no), or consist of a wh-question word. Both are used to probe for information, however the polar interrogative is used to determine simple types of information while the wh-interrogative requests that interactants provide the missing element of the clause structure as filled by the wh-question word. Imperative clauses, or
commands, are implicitly directed to the addressee and function to demand that the addressee do something or act in a specific way (Egins & Slade, 1997).

**Commands.** In general, Ms. C used commands to segway to reading and to prompt students to reference the illustrations of the book. In ES and SS genres, Ms. C used commands when segwaying to reading as a way of modeling the act of reading/writing. In SS and SNNI genres, Ms. C used commands when prompting children’s reference to illustrations and describing the illustrations for them. Ms. C used commands in ENNI mainly when prompting children to reference the illustrations in the book in order to model the act of referencing illustrations and to highlight narrative aspects of nonnarrative books.

**Statements.** For the most part, Ms. C used statements to explain vocabulary targets and to clarify/reinforce students’ text-related answers. Ms. C used statements in the SS context to explain a range of vocabulary targets and to recap the text that she had just read with attention to character mental state and single action story events. In the ES context, Ms. C used statements to clarify and reinforce character ID and to explain abstract nouns. In the ENNI context, Ms. C used statements to describe illustrations with attention to the attributes of topics or objects and to focus on narrative aspects of the nonnarrative texts. She also used statements to recap text that she had just read in order to attend to characteristic events and a description of attributes. In SNNI, Ms. C used statements to explain a range of vocabulary targets and to clarify/reinforce students’ text-related answers that centered on a description of attributes.

**Questions.** In storybook genres, Ms. C used questions to prompt students’ recall of information and to clarify/reinforce students’ text-related answers. Instead, in
informational book genres, questions were used by Ms. C to prompt book-to-life connections for children. In the ES genre, Ms. C used questions prompt students to recall information from the text about character agentive action and book parts/vocabulary of books. In this activity, Ms. C also used questions to clarify/reinforce students’ text related answers around character agentive action. In the SS genre, Ms. C used questions to prompt students’ recall of book parts/vocabulary of books, prompt their reference to the illustrations, and clarify/reinforce students’ text related answers around character ID. Ms. C used questions in the ENNI genre to prompt fill-in-the-blank questions about description of attributes, and to prompt book-to-life connections with a focus on narrative aspects of the nonnarrative book. In the SNNI genre, questions are used by Ms. C to prompt book-to-life connections around characteristic events.

**Theme**

The theme of a sentence is the initial noun phrase of a clause which acts as the starting point of the message and which indicates what that statement will be about. It usually contains information that has been introduced beforehand and which will be expanded upon in the rheme, or the remainder of the clause (Eggins, 1994).

**Non-topical themes.** Ms. C used non-topical themes, or words at the beginning of phrases and sentences that signal a move in the discourse, across all read aloud sessions. Non-topical themes were used for different purposes across read aloud sessions. In all genres, these discourse features were used by Ms. C to signal that she wanted to recap the text she had just read or prompt students to recall information from the book. With storybooks, Ms. C used non-topical themes in situations where she was signaling her
move to begin reading again and to ask children about what they remember from the text. In contrast, this discourse feature was used to signal students to look at the pictures in informational books and to make connections to the content in the books.

In the ENNI genre, Ms. C used non-topical themes when prompting students to reference the illustration and recapping the text just read to review characteristic events and descriptions of attributes. In both ES and SS sessions, Ms. C used non-topical themes when segwaying to reading the text as a way to model the act or reading/writing and to recap or prompt recall of the text around a range of narrative and print knowledge targets. In the SNNI genre, Ms. C used non-topical themes to prompt book-to-life connections around characteristic events, and to describe and prompt children to reference the illustration for a range of print knowledge and nonnarrative targets.

Process

The process of a clause denotes the action of a message as well as the experience of the speaker. Selecting a process entails choosing the manner in which the speaker is to be represented in experiencing that particular action and the role that the direct object will assume. For example, the speaker is construed as an actor in the material process which describes doing; a senser in the mental process of thinking, feeling or perceiving; a behaver in the behavioral process which describes physiological and psychological aspects of doing; a sayer in the verbal process of speaking; an existent in the existential process of being; and a carrier in the relational process of attributing or identifying (Eggins, 1994).
Behavioral processes were used by Ms. C to prompt children to reference illustrations in SS, ENNI and SNNI genres (e.g., look/mira), to prompt children to describe illustrations in ES and SNNI (e.g., doing/crying), to encourage them to recall the text in ES (helping, happened, taking, doing), and to clarify/reinforce student text-related answers around character ID in SS (e.g., caer [fall], vivian [they lived], durmiendo [sleeping]).

Material processes were used by Ms. C to prompt children to make book-to-life connections in SNNI and ENNI, to encourage them to describe illustration in ENNI, to prompt children to recall the text in ES, to recap the text for children in SNNI. In the SS genre, Ms. C used only a few material processes sporadically for different strategies.

Mental processes were used by Ms. C to prompt children to make book-to-life connections around narrative aspects of the informational books in ENNI, to segway to reading in ES and SS activities, to describe or prompt reference to the illustration in SS and SNNI activities, and to prompt children to recall the text in SS contexts.

Relational processes were used by Ms. C to describe or prompt children to reference the illustration in ENNI and SNNI sessions, and to prompt children’s recall of the text in ES and SS sessions. Verbal processes were used mostly in the SS genre to segway to reading as a way of modeling the act of reading. Few existential processes were used across the read alouds in general.

**Taxis**

Taxis refers to the way in which the speaker expresses and creates logical relationships between the phrases of a sentence and between sentences in a discussion
through the use of conjunctions and references. Construing logical relationships is a way in which a speaker creates cohesion of their ideas and thus coherence in their message. Conjunctions work as logical connectors to elaborate, expand, and enhance the meaning of a primary clause by connecting it to a secondary clause (Eggin, 1994).

**Elaboration.** When expanding a phrase through elaboration, speakers add information onto the sentence through the use of a conjunction that helps to exemplify, clarify, or provide an alternative way in which to state or support the point that is being made in the primary clause. In the ENNI genre, Ms. C did not often expand her sentences in this way, but when she did, she did so when implementing a variety of strategies, mostly with attention to characteristic events. In the ES genre, Ms. C often elaborated her sentences in this way when explaining abstract nouns, and when segwaying to reading as a way to model the act of reading/writing. In the SNNI genre, Ms. C used these types of complex sentences when prompting book to life connections around characteristic events and describing illustrations around a range of targets. In the SS genre, Ms. C elaborated on her sentences when segwaying to reading and when prompting children to reference the illustration.

**Causal enhancement.** When expanding a phrase through causal enhancement, speakers add a phrase to their primary clause, through use of a conjunction, which helps to add qualifying information about the cause or condition of the sentence’s original message. In ES, ENNI, and SNNI sessions, this type of expansion was rarely used by Ms. C. When Ms. C did expand her phrases this way, she did so to prompt children to recall the text in the ES genre, to recap the text she had just read around the cause of characteristic events in the ENNI genre, and to recap the text she had just read around the
description of attributes in the SNNI genre. In the SS activity, this discourse feature was used mostly when Ms. C was explaining different vocabulary targets and recapping the text that she had just read with regards to single action story events.

**Manner-based enhancement.** When expanding a phrase through manner-based enhancement, speakers connect a secondary clause on to their initial phrase, through use of a conjunction, which helps to add qualifying information about the manner in which the information in the primary clause was carried out. Manner-based enhancement was only used by Ms. C in the SS read aloud to recap the text she had just read with a focus on single action story events. This discourse feature was not at all prevalent in Ms. C’s extratextual talk.

**Spatially-based enhancement.** A spatially-based enhancement allows a speaker to expand their sentence to include information about the place in which the subject/action/topic was located or took place. Similar to the findings around enhancement – manner taxis, Ms. C was only found to use this discourse feature in SS read alouds when explaining concrete nouns and clarifying/reinforcing students’ text-related answers around setting ID. Like the manner-based enhancement, spatially-based enhancements were not at all prevalent in Ms. C’s extratextual talk.

**Extension.** By adding an extension to their initial phrases, a speaker adds a new element, gives an exception to, or offers an alternative to the information that they provided in their primary clause. Similar to the findings of manner-based and spatially-based enhancements, Ms. C only extended her sentences in the SS session when prompting children’s reference to illustrations as a way of modeling how a child engages
with the pictures of a book. Similar to the results of manner-based and spatially-based enhancements, this discourse feature was not at all prevalent in Ms. C’s extratextual talk.

Teacher’s Discourse in Instructional Strategies and Targets: Functionality

In this section, I provide a deeper linguistic analysis of the discourse features that are present when Ms. C implemented specific instructional strategies and targets shown to be prevalent in the genre and language read aloud activities. First, I present a short summary of the trends in Ms. C’s use of instructional strategies and targets in each genre and language context. I then use excerpts from the transcript to highlight the most salient instructional strategy and target in each session and present an analysis of Ms. C’s discourse features underlying her implementation of these strategies and targets across different genres of text in different languages.

A Comparison of Teacher’s Discourse in Instructional Strategies and Targets during English vs. Spanish Storybook Read Alouds

Vocabulary instruction. Vocabulary targets represent specific lexical items (vocabulary words) that the teacher focused on explicitly in order to foster children’s vocabulary knowledge across a variety of types of word classes. In general, Ms. C attended to almost three times as many vocabulary targets in the single reading of the ES genre than in the single reading of the SS genre. In the ES read aloud, Ms. C attended mostly to abstract nouns (e.g., advice), and also made more references to adjective/adverbs (e.g., regular, soft) and concrete nouns (e.g., boat, name) than she did in the SS read aloud. In contrast, in the SS genre, Ms. C paid equal attention to each of
the vocabulary targets, except for prepositions, which she did not discuss in any of the read alouds. She also made fewer references to verbs than the other vocabulary targets in general.

Additionally, Ms. C used a wider variety of instructional strategies, specifically six different techniques, when discussing or teaching vocabulary in ES read alouds than she did in the SS read aloud, where she used three different techniques. In both ES and SS sessions, the most prevalent strategy used by Ms. C with regard to vocabulary targets was to explain vocabulary, which occurred much more frequently than instances in each storybook session when Ms. C would prompt students to provide vocabulary explanations. The second most common instructional strategy used by Ms. C in the ES read aloud activity was to clarify or reinforce student text-related answers. Clarifying a student text-related answer meant that the teacher had either misheard the child’s statement or had evaluated the child’s statement to be incorrect and had repeated part or all of what the student had said, usually in a question form, in order to check and/or clarify what the student’s meaning or understanding (e.g., Ms. C stating “You think that’s a toilet?” after a child states incorrectly “That’s the toilet” when pointing to a picture of a boat). Reinforcing a student text-related answer meant that the teacher had heard and understood a child’s statement and repeated part or all of what they had said as a way in which to affirm and support their response (e.g., Ms. C stating “Louis was the name of the baby” after children respond “Louis” to the Ms. C’s question about whether they remember the name of the baby in the story *Oonga Boonga*). Overall, most of the strategies that Ms. C employed in either context involved more teacher talk than opportunity for student talk. This meant that, with regards to the variety of instructional
strategies that she used, each of them involved Ms. C talking and providing the children
with information (e.g., explain vocabulary) rather than Ms. C prompting children to
provide her with the information (e.g., Prompt explanation of vocabulary).

Explaining abstract nouns. This section discusses the discourse features that
were functional in the two different approaches that Ms. C took to explain abstract nouns
across ES and SS read alouds. Overall, Ms. C paid more attention to abstract nouns and
used a wider variety of instructional strategies when explaining the words to students. In
both ES and SS read alouds, Ms. C only used declarative statements when explaining
abstract nouns. There was some evidence of Ms. C using modals to explain abstract
nouns in the English but not the Spanish storybook read aloud. In terms of theme in the
ES read aloud, Ms. C used several non-topical conjunctions, continuatives, and
conjunctive adjuncts at the beginning of her sentences to signal that she was evaluating a
child’s response, providing an example related to her vocabulary definition, or mimicking
a likely interaction that exemplified the abstract noun. These practices were not
documented in the SS read aloud.

In the ES read aloud, Ms. C was found to explain abstract nouns in several
different ways that provided a more multi-faceted explanation of the focal word, such as
by providing a simple definition (which was supported through the use of relational and
material processes), a non-example (which was supported through the use of a verbal
process), and an example through mimicked interaction (which involved a variety of
processes because Ms. C had to construct the context and the conversation of the
interaction). In support of her discussion around the focal word in the ES genre, Ms. C
expanded her phrases through hypotaxis in different ways, such as by including
secondary clauses that helped to elaborate, extend, and enhance her points. Instead, in the SS genre, Ms. C defined abstract nouns by providing a simple definition of the word and then using the word in a sentence that showcased its contextualized use and meaning. As such, this required much fewer types of processes, namely only relational and material, and only required the use of one or two hypotactically expanded phrases. She also engaged in the unique instructional technique of gesturing to help explain the meaning of the words.

The following excerpt from the English storybook read aloud of *Oonga Boonga* showcases a number of discourse features that Ms. C typically employed when providing an explanation of an abstract noun in the ES read aloud. In this example, Ms. C has just stopped reading the book, having come across the word “advice”. She starts off by asking students to define the word “advice”. The analysis for this section will focus on Ms. C’s explanation of the abstract noun “advice” on line 13. The transcription contains numbers for each line of text from each speaker in order to facilitate and support subsequent discussion of these different parts in the paragraph below. In addition, superscript letters in parentheses are used to highlight specific words that will be elaborated in the discussion.

1  Ms. C: “Advice”. Who remembers what advice means?
2  Raquel: It means that somebody talks.
3  Ms. C: Somebody talks and tells you what?
4  Raquel: Something to do.
5  Ms. C: Something to do. To, to help you, really?
6  Raquel: Yes.
Ms. C: It’s like a tip. Somebody gives you something to do.

Gabriel: Like Cat in the Hat.

Ms. C: Cat in the Hat gives you advice? You know that. You know better.

Dwight: I have a Cat in the Hat movie at my house.

Ms. C: We’re reading the story right now. Uh huh, Raquel? {Raquel has her hand up}

Raquel: When, XXX you have to clean up and it’s messy, they have to clean up and that’s something to do.

Ms. C: (a) Well an advice is not really telling you what to do in that way. (b) It tells you what to do, like a tip. (c) Like I think you should clean the table with soap, because when you use soap it helps you to remove all the dirt on the table. (d) And then I say Oh, I’m going to try that but it’s not telling me go and clean the table with soap! (e) It’s not like that, it’s an advice. (f)

It’s telling me what to do that could be.

In terms of mood, Ms. C only used declarative statements, such as those showcased in sentences a-b, to explain the meaning of “advice”. This aligned with her intention to provide a description of the word that would be perceived as factual by children. To provide a nuanced meaning of the word “advice”, Ms. C used the modal “should” in sentence c to showcase the degree of obligation involved in the word “advice”. The use of this modal provided children with several different understandings of the semantic representation of the word “advice”.

During her explanation, Ms. C employed several non-topical themes, such as conjunctions, continuatives, and conjunctive adjuncts, for specific purposes. The
continuative “well” in sentence a is used by Ms. C as way in which to signal her evaluation of and connection to the child’s previous response. She used the continuative “like” in sentence c to indicate that she was providing an example of the abstract word, and “oh” to express a new move to the next point or interaction within her construed example. In terms of processes, Ms. C used relational verbs, like that in sentence a, to suggest that the child’s previous attempt at defining the word was actually a non-example of the word “advice”. She used several other different types of processes, such as the verbal process of “tell” in sentences b and d, the mental process of “think” in sentence c, and the material processes of “do” and “try” in sentences a and d to construct the context of a mimicked interaction that served as an example of the word “advice”. In terms of taxis, Ms. C used many different types of expansions of her phrases that helped to provide reasoning for her assertions and to present her points in various ways. For example, she provided justification for why one should take advice by including the hypotactically-linked secondary clause “because when you use soap…” in sentence c and also provided a juxtaposition with the paratactically linked secondary clause “but it’s not telling me…” in sentence d. These complex sentences help to enrich her example and may help to make her explanation of the vocabulary word more meaningful and comprehensible to students.

However, Ms. C implements a much less dynamic method of explaining abstract nouns in the SS read aloud. In the following excerpt, Ms. C is reading Los vegetales feos when she comes across the abstract noun “apetito” [appetite] and pauses from reading the book to explain the word to children.
Ms. C: {She begins to read.} “El viento llevaba el aroma por toda la calle. Como sería que hasta las abejas y las mariposas parecían oler el perfume de la brisa. Yo también lo sentí. El olor me abrió el apetito. [The wind carried the aroma all over the street. It seemed as if even the bees and the butterflies smelled the perfumed breeze. I also smelled it. The aroma made me hungry] {Makes circular motion with hand over her stomach, feigning hunger.} Y venía de mi casa.” {to class} [and it was coming from my house]

Ms. C: El apetito [es] cuando nos da hambre. {Again, makes the same gesture with her hand.} Cuando se les abre el apetito significa que nos da hambre. {Begins to show illustrations to class.} [Appetite is when you are hungry. When you have an appetite it means that we are hungry].

In this example, after pausing from reading the text, Ms. C defines “apetito” using a declarative statement as she did in the ES genre when explaining an abstract noun. While defining the word, she also implements the unique technique of making a stomach-rubbing gesture (line 2) to support students’ learning of this potentially new, abstract noun in Spanish. Ms. C’s first attempt at defining the word comprises a simple sentence, free of modals, in which the theme of the sentence is the focal vocabulary word “apetito” which she defines in the remainder of the sentence, or rheme, as being hungry. She does this through using the relational verb “es” [is] to equate the theme with the rheme. After this initial definition, Ms. C provides another declarative statement that she begins with the complement “cuando” [when] and used the figure of speech “abre el apetito” (literally to “open one’s appetite”) to extend her first definition and showcase how the word is
used in another context. Again, she equates the figure of speech, through the use of another relational verb “significa” [means], with the instance in which one is hungry, a similar definition to her first explanation. She also used a relational verb to equate the figure of speech to the same definition that she had provided to students before. So although Ms. C defines the focal word in two ways and used gestures to support her explanations, there is little variation in the processes that she used, no nuanced meanings through the use of modals, and few complex sentences. Moreover, we do not see Ms. C engage in as many multi-faceted instructional strategies around abstract nouns in the SS genre, nor does she connect her explanations through non-topical themes that help to signal and link her discourse moves.

**Narrative genre instruction.** Ms. C highlighted almost double the number of narrative targets in the SS read aloud than in the ES read aloud. The distribution of specific targets also varied greatly between the two activities. In the ES event, Ms. C attended to character-focused targets (such as character as agent, character as participant, and character identification), and the literary language of the book. In contrast, in the SS read aloud, she highlighted aspects of the setting, story events (such the causal chain, series of action, and single actions of the story events) and the characters’ mental state.

Although Ms. C used a similar variety of instructional strategies to attend to narrative targets in both ES and SS genres, there was a difference in the distribution of strategies that she used. While in both sessions Ms. C clarified or reinforced student text-related answers as a way to navigate the narrative features of the text for children, she was much more likely to prompt children to recall aspects of the text in the ES read aloud, and to recap the text that she just read for students as well as prompt children to
make predictions in the SS read aloud. These results suggest that Ms. C’s attention to narrative targets varied across languages, since she attended to more narrative targets in general in the SS read aloud, and in particular, focused on the setting and sequences of events, while focusing on the characters and the literary language in the ES genre. In both sessions, Ms. C provided an opportunity for students to engage in discussion – through recall in the ES read aloud and through predictions in the SS read aloud – while still scaffolding the students’ understanding by clarifying/reinforcing student answers and recapping the text that she had read.

*Prompting recall of the text with attention to character action (as agent).* This section provides an analysis of how Ms. C’s discourse features were functional when instructing children on narrative targets in ES and SS read alouds. In general, Ms. C attended to more character-focused targets, like character agentive action, in the ES genre and more story event features, such as single action story events, in the SS genre. There were more instances where Ms. C prompted students to recall the text in ES and more instances where Ms. C recapped the text for students in the SS read aloud.

Ms. C prompted recall of the text around character action through questions in ES and SS read alouds. Ms. C used yes/no clause questions and wh-clause questions to prompt children’s recall of the text around character action (agent), but did not use any modals. The wh-clause questions were phrased with the question word “what” since Ms. C was discussing character action rather than character ID, which would have required “who” (e.g., What was she doing? What was the father doing?). In the yes/no clause questions, Ms. C was asking about a particular action that the character was doing (e.g.,
Y las estaban revolviendo? [And they were stirring it around?] Does somebody remember what the grandma was doing?)

In both sessions, non-topical themes in the form of conjunctions were used with wh-clause and yes/no clause questions. Each question began with the conjunction “and” or “y” which Ms. C used to help connect the question back to the text that she had previously read relating to the character action. The processes that Ms. C used in these questions about character action (agent) were behavioral in nature, prompting children to recall the type of action that the character was involved in and using relational verbs to attribute these actions to the character (e.g., What was he doing? Y las estaban revolviendo? [And the were stirring it around?]) No particular pattern was found across aspects of taxis in each of the questions, however at times Ms. C would add taxis to elaborate or extend the question when she phrased it in a way that described how she wanted students to engage in thinking (e.g., Does somebody remember what the grandma was doing?)

Ms. C prompted students to recall the text more often in ES than SS genres, and thus there was much more variety in terms of the types of questions, the processes, the themes and the complexity of sentences in English than Spanish storybooks. This also indicated that the children in the ES activity were afforded with more opportunities to talk about text information since the teacher was asking them to recall and summarize information from the text. This meant that children were encouraged by the teacher to speak and to answer her questions relating to the events and actions that had taken place according to the most recent excerpt of text that Ms. C had read.
Recapping the text just read with attention to story events (single action). In ES and SS sessions, Ms. C recapped the text (with regard to a single action in the story) through the use of statements. Ms. C used one instance of a modal verb when recapping single actions from the text in the SS read aloud. The use of a “high obligation” modal enabled her to communicate to students why characters in the book were using different gardening tools in the SS read aloud *Los vegetales feos* (e.g., Los vecinos utilizan unas regaderas verdes pequeñas y ellas tienen que utilizar una enorme manguera) [The neighbors use small, green watering cans and they have to use an enormous water hose].

The theme of Ms. C’s statements was usually the focal characters, although a few times Ms. C placed objects in the initial subject position and discussed events that related to them (e.g., So the pictures were falling off the wall). In the SS genre, Ms. C did not begin any of her statements, which were recapitulating single actions from the story, with non-topical themes and only began one sentence with a complement that helped to connect a previous point to her current statement (e.g., Por eso hacían unos papelitos para – especiales para esos vegetales) [For this reason, they made small pieces of paper – that were especially for those vegetables]. Ms. C used the complement “por eso” [for this reason] to introduce a causal connection between a previous point and the information in the current statement.

In the SS genre, the most common processes used by Ms. C to recap single events from the text were material processes that detailed the characters’ physical actions (e.g., Los vecinos los dieron flores y ellas les dieron sopa) [The neighbors gave them flowers and they gave them soup]. Ms. C also used several mental processes to describe elements of characters’ knowledge and learning (e.g., Aprendieron unos de los otros) [They
learned from each other]. In the ES session, Ms. C used a behavioral process, which was unique in comparison to the other processes used by Ms. C, to recap an event that occurred with an object (e.g., so the pictures were falling off the wall).

Many of Ms. C’s statements in the SS read aloud were complex in nature and were paratactically related, meaning that they comprised of two independent clauses that were joined by conjunctions. This meant that Ms. C presented two related facets of a single event as they were experienced by different characters (e.g. Los vecinos les dieron flores y ellas les dieron sopa [The neighbors gave them flowers and they gave them soup]; Los vecinos utilizan unas regaderas verdes pequeñas y ellas tienen que utilizar una enorme manguera) [The neighbors use small, green watering cans and they had to use an enormous hose].

The instances in which Ms. C recapped the text for children in ES were few and far between and were simple in nature. Instead, Ms. C in the SS activity stopped numerous times in her reading of the text to recap the information for children. Her summaries to children comprised more varied processes, more complex sentences, more nuanced meanings, and thus, were more supportive of students’ understanding of the story and exposure to Spanish academic language as it related to the text.

Print knowledge instruction.

**Engaging with illustrations as a way to model the act of referencing pictures in the text.** Ms. C attended more frequently to print knowledge targets in SS read alouds than she did in ES read alouds and distinctly attended to these targets across ES and SS genres. For example, Ms. C showed a preference for highlighting book parts/vocabulary
of books and the print knowledge target of word in the ES read aloud, but was more prone to discuss the act of reading/writing and the act of referencing illustrations in the SS session. Ms. C did not reference letters or print organization explicitly in either the ES or SS read alouds.

In terms of strategies, Ms. C called attention to print knowledge in both ES and SS genres by segwaying to reading, which she did more frequently in the SS activity. The other typical strategy that she used in ES read alouds was to prompt children to recall the text and to clarify/reinforce their text-related answers. Instead, in the SS read aloud, Ms. C attended to print knowledge targets by frequently prompting children to refer to the illustrations in the book. These results showed that Ms. C highlighted different aspects of print knowledge in ES and SS genres, and with the exception of segwaying to reading, through different instructional strategies. Thus, she navigated children’s engagement with print knowledge targets differentially across storybook readings in English and Spanish.

**Illustration descriptions.** There were several ways that Ms. C encouraged students to engage with the pictures of the English and Spanish storybooks, namely through describing illustrations for them, prompting children to provide illustration descriptions, and prompting children to reference the illustrations. Results showed that there were noticeable differences across storybook read alouds in terms of the frequency to which Ms. C implemented each of these strategies and the ways in which she modeled the act of referencing illustrations.

Ms. C described illustrations once in the ES session but engaged in this practice five times in the SS read aloud. When describing illustrations, Ms. C highlighted actions and events in the pictures that supported the information that she had read from the text.
One way in which Ms. C did this was to use a non-topical conjunction to form a link between the information that she had just read, and the events in the pictures that she tried to highlight (e.g., Y vieron como todos compartieron la sopa) [And see how they are all sharing the soup]. In the ES genre, Ms. C used statements when providing descriptions, while in the SS genre, Ms. C used both statements and commands. Ms. C used one instance of a “high probability” modal when describing a picture and determining which character was responsible for carrying out a specific action (e.g., Yeah, that was probably Louise or Daniel). Most of the statements or commands were unmarked, meaning that commands started with a focal verb as the theme, typically “mira” or “look”, and statements started with a subject such as “el niño” [student], “toda la familia” [all the family], a reference such as “that”, or an implicit subject in the conjugated Spanish verb “salta”. Moreover, some of these referents, “el niño” and “toda la familia”, were explicit while others referred implicitly to the focal characters.

There was a large variety of processes given that Ms. C was doing a number of things in her statements and commands. In her commands, she was both calling students’ attention to the book and describing the illustrations, which required behavioral processes (e.g., Y vieron como todos compartieron la sopa) [And look at how they are all sharing the soup] and material processes to describe actions and to provide attributes of the illustrations that she was referencing (e.g., Todo el mundo compartieron la sopa y las flores) [Everyone shared the soup and the flowers].

There were many complex sentences in Ms. C’s illustration descriptions, especially in the SS read aloud. The secondary clause of Ms. C’s statements and commands functioned to elaborate on how characters or events were being enacted in the
illustration (e.g., Mira como viene el aroma [Look at how the aroma is coming]; Y vieron como todos compartieron la sopa [And did you see how they all shared the soup?]). In the ES session, Ms. C did not use taxis because she only used relational processes to identify characters (e.g., Yeah, that was probably Louis or Daniel).

**Prompting children to provide illustration descriptions.** Across ES and SS genres, Ms. C used questions to encourage children to describe the illustrations. While Ms. C used this particular strategy equal times across ES and SS read alouds, her discourse features, and thus the way that she prompted students, differed across language of book/instruction. There were several features that indicated that Ms. C was more strategic in her prompts and more effective at modeling the act of referencing illustrations in the SS read aloud. The first unique feature was the “high obligation” modals that Ms. C used when encouraging illustration descriptions from children in the Spanish language context. Rather than trying to get a child to describe a picture by asking what a character is doing, as she did in ES (e.g., What’s the bunny doing?; What is the bunny doing in the water?), in the SS read aloud, Ms. C explicitly asked the child to justify his answer by citing events that they see in the picture (e.g., Que tu ves que te hace decir eso? [What do you see that makes you say that]; Que to ves que te hace pensar que se va caer? [What do you see that makes you think he will fall?]). The “high obligation” modal emphasis on “hace decir” [make you say] and “hace pensar” [make you think] communicates to children that the picture contains information about the story and that they can use the picture to justify their thoughts and responses. This is a much more strategic way to instruct children on the utility and function of book illustrations, and is a much more
scaffolded way of encouraging children to describe illustrations than the prompts used by Ms. C in the ES genre.

The difference in the quality of questions also originates from the difference in their structures. While the theme of the two questions are similar, both asking “what”, Ms. C’s question in ES used a relational verb to identify and ask about the behavior of the character (e.g., What is the bunny doing?). Rather, Ms. C’s question in the SS activity (e.g., ¿Que tú ves que te hace decir eso? [What do you see that makes you say that?]) is much more complex and much more strategic since it forefronts the student’s perspective, “Que tu ves” [What do you see], specifying that the student should be engaging in the mental process of “seeing”, and then adds a secondary phrase through causal enhancement that questions the student about the origin of that perspective “que te hace decir eso?” [What makes you say that?]. Moreover, while both questions suggest that the children respond verbally, the more complex question in Spanish states this more explicitly for the children, as specified in the verbal process of “decir” [say].

**Prompting children to reference the illustrations.** Ms. C prompted children to refer to the illustrations, but only in the SS session, asking both questions and statements to this end (e.g., Vieron las sopa de los vegetales? [Did you see the vegetable soup?]; Miren a la foto [Look at the photo]). When implementing this strategy, Ms. C did not use any modals, and the theme for most of the questions and commands were mostly unmarked. The commands in SS were also found to be conjugated in the plural sense (e.g., Vieron como todos comieron la sopa? [Did you see how everyone ate the soup?]). There were a few non-topical themes in the SS, one of which was a vocative after Ms. C stated a command (e.g., Mira Jeremiah [Look Jeremiah]) and one which was expressive
in nature which also preceded a command prompting children to reference the illustration (e.g., Uy, mira toda la sopa que tenian [Wow, look at all the soup they had]).

The most common processes were behavioral in nature since Ms. C was commanding students to look at the pictures (e.g., Mira que lindo [Look how pretty]) and mental in nature since Ms. C was asking if they were seeing specific features of the picture (e.g., ¿Vieron las sopa de los vegetales? [Did you see the vegetable soup?]). Most taxis occurred in the SS activity and was represented by elaboration where Ms. C would describe how actions were carried out in the illustrations (e.g., Vieron como todos comieron la sopa? [Did you see how everyone ate the soup?]) There was also one phrase where Ms. C included a secondary clause to describe what the characters had (e.g., Mira toda la sopa que tenian [Look at all the soup they had]).

Overall, Ms. C’s illustration descriptions were more detailed and complex, her prompts encouraging children to describe illustrations were more strategic and supportive, and she encouraged children to reference the illustration many more times in the SS genre than the ES genre. Further, Ms. C provided more opportunities for children to engage with the illustrations and learn about their function, utility, and support in the act of reading.

Translanguaging. I use this term to represent the language practices that Ms. C engages in, inclusive of both productive and receptive forms of Spanish and English, in order to facilitate her communication with and inclusion of all students in the read aloud context. Ms. C translanguaged for different reasons across ES and SS sessions. In the ES read aloud, Ms. C used Spanish three times, in the form of two questions and a statement, to prompt children to make book-to-life connections. The excerpt below showcases how
Ms. C tried to integrate a child’s real life experience into the discussion since it represents a similar event as is being portrayed in the book. At this point in the read aloud, Ms. C had paused from reading the text and addressed Ernesto who had his hand raised.

1 Teacher: What did you want to say Ernesto? Thank you for helping.
2 Ernesto: My brother cried and cried and cried and I couldn’t eat.
3 Teacher: Have [sic] your brother cried before like that, like Louis?
4 Ernesto: Yeah.
5 Ms. C: Yes? Uy. And what does your mommy do? Se dice Gordo ya deja de llorar. [She says stop crying Gordo?]
6 Ernesto: Si. [Yes]
7 Ms. C: Sí? Y se calla gordo? [Yes? And Gordo quiets down?]
8 Ernesto: No. [No.]
9 Ms. C: Llora y llora y llora? [He cries and he cries and he cries?]
10 Ernesto: And he keeps on crying my little brother.

Ms. C first translanguages when mimicking, through statement form, what she believes Ernesto’s mother would say in the event that his little brother doesn’t stop crying (line 5). This may be in response to her knowledge of Ernesto as a Spanish-dominant child whose parents are from Cuba and who speak Spanish with him at home. After Ernesto answers (line 6), Ms. C asks a yes/no clause question (line 7) and then continues on to ask another yes/no clause question (line 9) to which Ernesto responds in English (line 10). Both questions were yes/no clause questions but were structured as statements (e.g., Si? [Yes?] Y se calla gordo? [And Gordo quiets down?] Llora y llora y llora? [He cries and he cries and he cries?]). In her instruction, Ms. C had used a question-like intonation pattern to
indicate that she was asking a question and not making a statement. Both of these questions only encouraged Ernesto to provide close-ended responses even though she may have been translanguaging in an attempt to support his participation in the read aloud and make the connection between the book and his actual experience.

In the SS activity, Ms. C translanguaged in order to prompt predictions from students. Specifically, she used English seven times to ask open-ended “what” questions that encouraged students to discuss their thoughts about possible next events in the story (e.g., What is she going to do?; She’s going to do what?; And what?; And what is she going to do? ), and “why” questions that encouraged students to justify these responses (e.g., Kyle, why do you think she uses a big shovel, and she used a little one?; Why do you think that?). Most of the questions focused on the character actions and were phrased using material processes (e.g., What is she going to do?) while some questions forefronted the students’ experience and thus were phrased using mental processes (e.g., Why do you think that?).

A Comparison of Teacher’s Discourse in Instructional Strategies and Targets during English and Spanish Nonnarrative Informational Read Alouds

Vocabulary Instruction

In general, Ms. C attended to a similar number of vocabulary targets in English nonnarrative informational (ENNI) read alouds and Spanish nonnarrative informational (SNNI) read alouds. In both languages, Ms. C highlighted concrete nouns more than any other vocabulary target and referenced verbs and keywords for all nouns the same
number of times. Similarly across language of book/instruction, she made little reference to abstract nouns, or prepositions, and only highlighted adjective/adverbs in Spanish nonnarrative informational read alouds. Overall, this suggests that concrete nouns seem to be a salient feature for Ms. C to discuss in nonnarrative informational books regardless of the language in which she was reading the book.

With regard to the variety of instructional strategies, Ms. C used a similar variety – specifically 5 different techniques – when discussing or teaching vocabulary in ENNI and SNNI read alouds. There was a noticeable difference, however, in the distribution of these strategies. In the SNNI read aloud, Ms. C attended to vocabulary through the use of three strategies - explaining vocabulary, emphasizing the text, and clarifying/reinforcing student text-related answers – that she employed more intensely than in the English read aloud. The most prominent strategy that Ms. C used across the ENNI read alouds was to emphasize the text for children, with other less predominant strategies including explaining vocabulary and clarifying/reinforcing students’ text related answers. She also implemented unique strategies like prompting vocab explanation and recapping the text that was read. These results show that Ms. C used more instructional strategies to help scaffold students’ understanding of the content in the English context, and also provided more opportunities for students’ engagement with vocabulary, since she only prompted children to explain vocabulary in this context.

Clarifying/reinforcing concrete nouns & verbs. This section discusses the discourse features that were functional in the three different approaches that Ms. C took to teach concrete nouns & verbs across ENNI and SNNI read alouds. Ms. C highlighted concrete nouns more than any other vocabulary target in NNI genres, and, in the SNNI
read aloud, Ms. C attended to vocabulary targets through the use of three strategies.

These techniques included explaining vocabulary, emphasizing the text, and clarifying/reinforcing student text-related answers.

Across ENNI and SNNI sessions, Ms. C only used declarative statements when clarifying or reinforcing students’ text-related answers with regard to vocabulary. She did not use modals in any of these clarifications or reinforcements of students’ text-related answers, and her statements were primarily comprised of single, simple phrases. A theme that emerged from the analysis was that Ms. C seemed to reinforce students’ vocabulary answers mostly in the ENNI activity but was found to clarify students’ vocabulary answers in the SNNI activity. Three different manners of clarifying/reinforcing students’ text-related answers were found across ENNI and SNNI read alouds. These included repeating students’ responses in a complete sentence/phrase, rephrasing students’ responses, or repeating verbatim students’ responses.

In the ENNI genre, Ms. C reinforced students’ vocabulary answers by modeling the answer in a complete sentence or phrase. The following excerpt from the ENNI read aloud session shows how Ms. C reinforced students’ vocabulary answers in this way.

Here, Ms. C paused from reading *The Tooth Book* to recap some of the information that she had just read and check students’ understanding.

1  Ms. C: {she reads from the book} “They come in handy when you chew,” says Mr. Donald Driscoll Drew. “That’s why my family grew a few.” {she stops reading the book} Who’s missing some...some teeth here?

2  Child: The kids.

3  Ms. C: The boy. He’s missing some...?
Children: More teeth.

Ms. C: He’s missing some more teeth.

After Ms. C pauses from reading the text, she asks children a wh-clause question (at the end of line 2). Once a student responds “the kids” and Ms. C specifies “the boy”, she asks a fill-in-the-blank question, encouraging the children to answer with the focal vocabulary word “teeth” (line 3). When students provide this response (line 4), Ms. C reinforces this answer by restating in full sentence form as it she had in the original phrase (end of line 1).

In the SNNI read aloud, there was also evidence that Ms. C rephrased the students’ responses to help clarify their meaning. The following excerpt demonstrates how Ms. C clarifies a student’s answer around the concrete noun “flamenco” in the SNNI session when reading the book Cuando Tomi se mueve. In this example, Ms. C responds to a student’s comment after having read about and defined the vocabulary word “flamenco”.

Ms. C: Uhhh… {She reads from the book} “Tomi aletea como un flamenco a punto de volar.” [Tomi flaps like a flamingo that is on the verge of flying]{She pauses} Un Flamenco son [sic] esas pájaros rosados que tienen patas largas. [A flamingo is those pink parrots that have large feet]{She reads from the book again} “Como un flamenco su reflejo aletea tan bien. [Like a flamingo his reflection flaps as well]”

Daniel: Y, y, y flamencos usan estos también. [And, and, and flamingos use these too]

Ms. C: Que usan? [What do they use?]
Ms. C is reading about flamingos in the book, and after she defines the word “flamenco” [flamingo], she describes some of its features and continues reading from the book (line 1). In response, Daniel makes a comment in an attempt to describe other attributes of the word. Ms. C does not seem to understand his assertion and prompts Daniel to repeat himself (line 3), to which Daniel rephrases his statement and comments on the way in which the bird positions its feet, using gestures to make sure that Ms. C understands what he means (line 4). Once Ms. C understands what he means, she clarifies his response by rephrasing it and modeling more standard Spanish structures. She does this by replacing the semantically-general verb “hacer” [to do/make], with the more spatially-descriptive verb of “levantar” [to lift up] and then translates into words the gesture that Daniel had been making, which was that the bird only lifts one foot.

At times across both read alouds, Ms. C asked a fill-in-the-blank prompt, and did not repeat the prompt with the focal vocabulary word after students responded correctly. Instead, she only repeated the focal vocabulary word, devoid of its context in the sentence. For example, when Ms. C asked a fill-in-the-blank question such as “Y él está pensando que su sombra es un--?”[And he is thinking that his shadow is a--?] and received the correct response, “cangrejo” [crab], from students, she reinforced this correct response by repeating it verbatim, without embedding it in the original context. Thus, at times, in each read aloud, she did not model the complete phrase or sentence when
reinforcing students’ answers. This linguistic analysis shows how even when Ms. C seemingly engaged in similar strategies across English and Spanish NNI read alouds, the ways in which she reinforced or clarified students’ responses differed according to the language context.

**Emphasizing concrete nouns & verbs.** Similar to the cross-language differences found in Ms. C’s clarification and reinforcement strategies in ENNI and SNNI genres, Ms. C was found to emphasize concrete nouns and verbs differently according to the target language. In both read alouds, Ms. C asked children fill-in-the-blank questions, to which children would respond with the focal concrete noun or verb that Ms. C intended to emphasize. While Ms. C emphasized these responses in each session, the manner in which Ms. C did so differed based on structural language differences between English and Spanish. In the ENNI genre, to emphasize concrete nouns, Ms. C was repeated only the response given by children. The excerpt below showcases how this took place during the ENNI reading of *The Tooth Book.*

1. Ms. C: {reading from the book} “TEETH! They are very much in style[s]. They must be very much worthwhile!” {She stops reading from the book} Look at this Jeremiah. The pumpkins have different styles of…?

3. Children: Teeth! (Children are screaming over each other)


Instead, in the SNNI genre, the way in which Ms. C emphasizes children’s answer to her fill-in-the-blank question differed based on structural features of the Spanish language. The excerpt below showcases this pattern from the SNNI reading of *Cuando Tomi se mueve.*
Ms. C: Y Tomi se imagina que su sombra son diferentes… [Tomi imagines that his shadow are different…] {her voice goes up, as if leading a question}--

Student: Animales. [Animals]

Diferentes animales. [Different animals]

After Ms. C asks the second fill-in-the-blank question (line 1), the students answers with the word that is missing, “animales” (line 2). Rather than repeating the word verbatim, as she did the ENNI session, Ms. C includes the adjective “diferentes” with “animales” (line 3). This adjective and noun are grammatically bound together given that both are pluralized. Since the pluralization carries across both words, Ms. C adds the adjective “diferentes” to the children’s response of “animales” in order to showcase and maintain the grammatical relationship between these two words. Thus, in emphasizing concrete nouns in Spanish, Ms. C applies a slightly different technique that corresponds to the grammaticality of Spanish pluralization that varies from that of English.

Nonnarrative Instruction

While Ms. C highlighted almost double the number of nonnarrative targets in ENNI read alouds than in SNNI read alouds, she attended to many of the same specific targets across these sessions, specifically characteristic events and description of attributes. Ms. C did not generally refer to the topic presentation or final summary of the informational books. Even though Ms. C was reading an informational book, she integrated a focus on more narrative aspects of the text in both the English and Spanish read alouds, such as discussing characters, setting, and features that were not part of the
global elements of the informational text. This occurred more frequently in the ENNI read aloud than the SNNI read aloud. Lastly, Ms. C did not make any reference to category comparisons in either book, although each book provided the opportunity for Ms. C to make category comparisons of the content. Further, Ms. C discussed the global elements of characteristic events and a description of attributes more than any other features of informational text, and more prominently in English than in Spanish read alouds.

Although Ms. C used a similar variety of instructional strategies to attend to nonnarrative targets in both ENNI and SNNI genres, there was a difference in the prevalence of specific strategies that she implemented to navigate these features of the text for children. The two most predominant strategies used by Ms. C in the ENNI activity were to make book-to-life connections for children and to recap the text that she had just read. In contrast, Ms. C encouraged children to make their own book to life connections and clarified/reinforced their text-related answers in the SNNI genre, although not with as much frequency as the prevalent strategies used in ENNI. These results show that Ms. C attended to similar nonnarrative features regardless of the language of the informational book that she was reading, but provided more support around these features in English read alouds since she more frequently made book-to-life connections for students, recapped the text, described illustrations, and prompted fill-in-the-blank statements. On the other hand, Ms. C provided more opportunities for students to make their own book-to-life connections in the Spanish read aloud, and provided more clarification and reinforcement of students’ answers. Moreover, Ms. C was less likely to focus on narrative aspects of the informational book in the Spanish read aloud, showing
that she was more responsive to the characteristic global elements of the informational genre in Spanish.

**Referencing and describing illustrations with a focus on narrative aspects.**

This section discusses the discourse features that were functional in the instructional practices that were prevalently used by Ms. C in ENNI and SNNI read alouds. In general, Ms. C focused on narrative aspects of the text through referencing and describing illustrations, in both ENNI and SNNI genres, even though she was reading and navigating informational books for children. Thus, instead of pointing out the focal object or their features and attributes, Ms. C prompted students to look at different characters, animals, and their actions, as she would have done when reading a narrative text. Ms. C focused on instructing children about characteristic events in both ENNI and SNNI activities, however she did so through different strategies. In the ENNI genre, Ms. C recapped the text in order to target characteristic events while in the SNNI genre, Ms. C prompted children to make book-to-life connections as a way to support their learning and understanding of characteristic events.

In both ENNI and SNNI read alouds, Ms. C prompted children to focus on features of narrative texts even though Ms. C was reading a nonnarrative text to children. In the ENNI genre, Ms. C prompted children to reference and describe illustrations with regard to character identity (as participant), while in the SNNI genre she prompted children to reference and describe illustrations with regard to both character identity (as participant) and character agentive action. She implemented these strategies through statements and commands, and without the use of modals.
Across ENNI and SNNI, the theme of the commands is the focal verb (e.g., Mira, Look), and the rheme provides a description of what she intends for the children to pay attention to in the illustration, which in this case are the characters (e.g., This is red-headed uncle; Mira Tomi, y esa es su mama [Look at Tomi and this is his mother] ) and character agentive actions (e.g., Salta como una rana [He jumps like a frog]). While both of these aspects exist in the nonnarrative books, they do not represent the main focus of the book since nonnarrative global elements attend more to a unifying topic than stories around specific characters. As such, the way in which Ms. C asks students to engage with the illustrations in nonnarrative books mimics the way that she prompted students to interact with pictures in narrative books in both ENNI and SNNI sessions. When analyzing the discourse features that Ms. C used in storybooks around these features, we see similarities in the processes and taxis that Ms. C used to command the children to look at the illustrations. For example, the processes are mostly behavioral, since Ms. C is commanding the children to look at the illustrations (e.g., Look at the unicycle riders) and relational, since Ms. C is linking the picture to the name of the character (e.g., Mira Tomi y esa es su mama [Look at Tomi and this is his mother]). In both ENNI and SNNI genres, Ms. C hypotactically extends her sentence using “and” to add information that she wants students to pay attention to (e.g., Look at the camels and the drivers, Mira Tomi y esa es su mama [Look at Tomi and this is his mother]).

Recapping text just read with attention to characteristic events. In both ENNI and SNNI read alouds, Ms. C used questions and statements to recap the text that she just read about characteristic events. However, Ms. C recaps the text much more in the ENNI genre than the SNNI genre. She used two instances of modality, both which are used to
further clarify and characterize the characteristic events (e.g., Remember that he’s going to get a new one after that; You see, you cannot chew hard things because -).

The theme of the questions and statements differs according to how Ms. C is presenting the characteristic event. In both the ENNI and SNNI sessions, she presents it from the perspective of the character, and used the character as the subject and the theme of the sentence (e.g., Todo lo que Tomi hace, su sombra también, lo…? [Everything that Tomi does, his shadow also…?]; Se mueve también [It moves as well]; Remember that he’s going to get a new one after that; They’re losing their set number two). Thus, most of the themes in ENNI and SNNI revolve around the characters as a way in which to discuss the experience and evolution of the characteristic events. Unique to the ENNI genre, Ms. C also related the information to the children themselves, describing how it would be for them to go through the characteristic events (e.g., and if you lose them, guess what?; You don’t get any other.)

There are also a couple of times in the ENNI read aloud where Ms. C used non-topical themes like “and”, “oh”, and “so”, each of which have different functions, to expand on text information (e.g., And if you lose them, guess what?), connect children’s outside experiences to the text (e.g., So like Aaron’s brother, he lost a tooth, Aaron said, but another one grew), and to help students summarize the information (e.g., Ohh so it’s not good to bite your dentist). However, non-topical themes only occurred in ENNI and not SNNI sessions.

There are a wide variety of processes used, including behavioral, mental, relational, material depending on how Ms. C constructs the sentence (with the use of current or past tense verbs), as well as how she positions the experience and who is
experiencing it in the sentence. Mental processes show that she wants students to see or remember facets of the information (e.g., You see, you cannot chew hard things because..; Remember that he’s going to get a new one after that). Material and Behavioral processes describe the actions and procedures involved in characteristic events (e.g., Se mueve tambien [It moves as well]; He cannot smile).

When looking at the taxis, not many phrases or questions had secondary clauses. Those that did showed a pattern whereby the added information enhanced the primary clause through causal connections like consequences (e.g., you see, you cannot chew hard things because-; and if you lose them, guess what? ) or results (e.g., there’s a lot of things you cannot eat if you don’t have…teeth). Although Ms. C implemented the recapping strategy across Spanish and English NNI read alouds, she did so more frequently in the ENNI read aloud, and thus provided more access to the information in the text through her summaries, which the linguistic analysis showed were much more varied and functional in the ENNI genre.

**Prompting book-to-life connection around characteristic events.** In both ENNI and SNNI activities, but mainly in the SNNI session, Ms. C prompts book to life connections with a focus on characteristic events through questions. She only used a modal, namely of “high obligation” in the ENNI genre to question children on the degree of importance carried by a certain characteristic event (e.g., Do we have to take care of our teeth?). The theme of the sentences in SNNI usually comprised of an adverbial phrase that established a situation upon which she wanted students to base their answers (e.g., Cuando tu tu mueves, que hace tu sombra? [When you move, what does your shadow
do?]). Instead, the theme of the ENNI sentences focused upon the personal perspective of the children in answering questions (e.g., Do we have to take care of our teeth?).

The processes that Ms. C used when prompting book-to-life connections were mostly material since the topic of the SNNI book revolved around shadow movement and the ENNI book revolved around the attributes of teeth. Most of the questions that Ms. C poses in SNNI activities were paratactic in nature whereby the secondary clause of the question elaborated to provide more specification about the circumstances involved (e.g., Cuando tú te mueves que hace tu sombra? [When you move what does your shadow do?]). Ms. C did not use questions with complex structures in the ENNI book setting. Moreover, the question that Ms. C asks in the ENNI read aloud was a yes/no clause question (e.g., Do we have to take care of our teeth?), while most of the questions in the SNNI read aloud were open-ended, prompting students to reply with more than a one-word answer (e.g., Y cuando tú te mueves que hace tu sombra? [When you move what does your shadow do?]).

The discourse features of Ms. C’s questions to prompt book-to-life connections for students around characteristic events were much more complex and varied in SNNI than ENNI, creating a different storybook reading environment across these languages.

**Print Knowledge Instruction**

Although Ms. C attended to one other print knowledge target in the SNNI read aloud than she did in the ENNI read aloud, there were several print knowledge targets that Ms. C did not discuss in either English or Spanish nonnarrative informational texts such as aspects of letters, words, or print organization. In both read alouds, Ms. C called
children’s attention to the act of reading and writing and the act of referencing illustrations, while in the SNNI read aloud, she also attended to naming book parts and using vocabulary around books.

Ms. C was found to use strategies around the illustrations of the book when navigating print knowledge aspects of informational genres of books in English and Spanish. For example, Ms. C encouraged children to look at and describe the illustrations more often in the ENNI genre, while she was more likely to describe the illustration for students in the SNNI genre. While Ms. C did not include attention to as many targets in the ENNI read aloud as that of SNNI, Ms. C provided more opportunities for children’s oral participation (i.e., productive responses to Ms. C’s questions) in ENNI read alouds.

Describing illustrations as a way to model the act of referencing illustrations. This section provides an analysis of the discourse features that lie beneath Ms. C’s different instructional strategies in an effort to document similarities and differences in the functionality of her practices. Overall, Ms. C was more likely to describe the illustrations for students in the SNNI genre, but more likely to prompt children to reference the illustration in the ENNI read aloud.

In ENNI and SNNI read alouds, Ms. C used commands and statements to describe illustrations. She does not use modality in these statements and commands. Most of these statements or commands were unmarked, meaning that Ms. C’s commands started with a focal verb as the theme (typically “Mira” or “Look”), and statements started with a subject (such as “El niño” [the child], “Toda la familia” [all the family], “that”, “salta” [jump]). Two of these referents are explicit and refer to characters in the illustration, while two were referents that allude to characters. One non-topical theme is used in SS,
but nowhere else (y vieron como todos compartieron la sopa [and did you see how everyone shared the soup?]).

Ms. C used a variety of processes given that she was doing a number of things in her statements and commands. In her commands, she was both calling students’ attention to the book, which required the behavioral processes of “Mira” and “Look”, and describing the illustrations, which required material and relational processes to describe actions and to provide attributes of the illustrations that she was referencing (e.g., Mira como viene el aroma [Look at how the aroma is coming]; Look those are big ones).

The secondary clause added on to the primary clause of Ms. C’s statements and commands functioned to predominantly elaborate and add information about how characters or events were being enacted in the illustration (e.g., Mira como viene el aroma [Look at how the aroma is coming]; Y vieron como todos compartieron la sopa [and did you see how everyone shared the soup?]), however this was the SNNI session. In the ENNI session, Ms. C did not use taxis because she only used relational processes to describe or attribute characteristics to objects (e.g., Look those are big ones). This meant that Ms. C’s depiction of illustrations in the ENNI read aloud was much less descriptive or expressive.

The following excerpt demonstrates an example of how Ms. C described the illustrations for children in the SNNI genre while reading Cuando Tomi se mueve. This excerpt showcases the beginning of the read aloud, during which she pauses several times to show the illustrations and describe the pictures:

1 Ms. C: {begins to read from the book} “Cuando Tomi se Mueve...Un dia soleado, Tomi se ve su sombra. Esta tan quieta como una tortuga que toma
el sol. Que hará mi sombra si me muevo?, pregunta Tomi. “Hazlo y ya veras, dice su mama.” [When Tomi moves…One sunny day, Tomi sees his shadow. It is still like a turtle that is sunbathing. “What will my shadow do if I move?” asks Tomi. “Do it and you will see,” says his mother]

2 Ms. C: {Ms. C shows students the illustration} (a) Mira Tomi, (b) y es es su mama. (c) Mira, (d) estaba pensando que su sombra era una tortuga porque estaba muy quieta. {a) Look at Tomi (b) and this is his mother. (c) Look, (d) he was thinking that his shadow was a turtle that was very still.}

3 Ms. C: {She begins reading again} “Tomi se agacha como un cangrejo. En una tierra soleado. Como un cangrejo su sombra se agacha también.” {Ms. C points to page} [Tomi crouches like a crab in a sunny spot. Like a crab, his shadow crouches as well.]

4 Ms. C: (a) Mira (b) como hace como un cangrejo asi (c) {she copies the picture} y su sombra -hacelo- [a) Look (b) how he is acting like a crab like that (c) and his shadow does-]

5 Children: MISMO [the same]

6 Ms. C: MISMO verdad? [the same, right?]

Ms. C stops twice after reading the first few sentences of the book. During the first pause (line 2), Ms. C shows students the illustration, prompts them to reference the picture (line 2a & 2c), identifies a character (line 2b), and describes the illustration for children, making sure to connect the information back to the text she had just read (line 2d). When Ms. C pauses from reading the text a second time (line 4), she again prompts them to
reference the picture (line 4a), describes the illustration for children (line 4b), and even
gestures in a way that mimics the action of the character in the book to help support the
shape/movement of a crab (line 4c).

**Prompting reference to illustration as a way to model the act of referencing illustrations.** This instructional strategy was more common in the ENNI read aloud than
the SNNI read aloud. However in both read alouds, Ms. C used commands, such as
“Mira” and “Look”, to prompt children to look at the picture (e.g., Look at this Jeremiah;
Mira, estaba pensando que su sombra era una tortuga porque estaba muy quieta [Look ,
he was thinking that his shadow was a turtle because he was very still]). Ms. C did not
use any modality when encouraging children to look at the pictures and the theme for
most of the commands was usually unmarked, meaning that Ms. C would prompt
students by placing a verb at the beginning of their sentences to direct children’s
attention. The commands in SNNI were all conjugated in the singular sense (e.g., Mira
reflejo en el los lentes del sol…del salvavidas [Look at the reflection in the
sunglasses…of the lifevest], while in ENNI, Ms. C used the verb “look” at the beginning
of her sentences, which did carry the same morphological variations as Ms. C’s prompt in
Spanish.

There were a few non-topical themes in the ENNI genre, one which was a
vocative after Ms. C stated a command (e.g., Mira Jeremiah [Look Jeremiah]) and two
which were the conjunctive adjuncts “so” signaling that Ms. C is relating her point to the
preceding text (e.g., So look at her or him actually, he has no what?). In the SNNI genre,
Ms. C used one non-topical theme, a conjunction to connect her command with her
statement pointing out another character (e.g., Mira Tomi, y es es su mama [Look at Tomi, and this is his mother]).

In the ENNI session, the most common process was behavioral (e.g., Look at the camels and the drivers), and in SNNI, the most common process was behavioral and relational since Ms. C was labeling characters and identifying character actions (e.g., Mira Tomi y esa es su mama [Look at Tomi, and this is his mother]; Mira, estaba pensando que su sombra era una tortuga porque estaba muy quieta [Look, he was thinking that his shadow was a turtle because he was very still]). For the most part, no taxis was used in the ENNI activity and paratactic projections were used in SNNI to add two pieces of information together, as a list, of what was in the picture (e.g., Mira, estaba pensando que su sombra era una tortuga porque estaba muy quieta [Look, he was thinking that his shadow was a turtle because he was very still]).

**Translanguaging.** Ms. C translanguaged for different reasons and used different strategies across ENNI and SNNI read alouds. In the ENNI read aloud, Ms. C used Spanish seven times, in the form of one question and six statements, to prompt children to make book-to-life connections, to forge these connections for children, to clarify/reinforce their text-related answers, and to end the storybook. In the SNNI read aloud, Ms. C used English four times in the form of 3 question and a statement to clarify/reinforce students’ text related answers, reference the illustration, and confirm students’ prediction or recall. There was only one strategy in which Ms. C translanguaged across both the ENNI and SNNI read alouds, which was to clarify/reinforce students’ text-related answers.
Across the various strategies, Ms. C’s translanguaging in the ENNI setting revolved around more personal topics, whereby she commented in Spanish on events that took place with the children (e.g., Ernesto ya perdió un diente [Ernesto already lost a tooth]), their family members (e.g., Tu hermano, verdad? [Your brother, right?]), and provided explanations about how the topic of the book related to children’s lives (e.g., Pero tenemos trece [But we have thirteen]) and her switch in target language (e.g., Ms. C XX una historia X en inglés pero ahora ya seguimos en español [Ms. C XX a story X in English but right now we will continue in Spanish]). For the most part, when translanguaging in the ENNI genre, Ms. C was talking to children who were either Spanish-dominant children or who had a more balanced proficiency in English and Spanish.

Ms. C’s translanguaging practices in the SNNI read aloud looked much different, and occurred when she clarified, in English, an English-dominant child’s assertion that a picture in the book looked like a whale and note a dolphin (e.g., What happened with the whale? You think this is a whale? Could be). In this interaction, the child had responded in English, and Ms. C answered him in English too, showcasing that Ms. C was matching to the language shift of the child. Instead, with the occurrences of translanguaging in the ENNI read aloud, the Spanish that Ms. C used was always initiated by Ms. C, and always occurred in interactions with children who had higher levels of proficiency in Spanish, even if they were responding to her in English. These patterns suggest that the translanguaging events were purposeful and strategic on the part of Ms. C, mostly for purposes of making connections in ENNI and to clarify/reinforce students’ text-related answers in SNNI.
A Comparison of Teacher’s Discourse in Instructional Strategies and Targets during English Storybook and English Informational Book Readings

Vocabulary Instruction

When comparing Ms. C’s focus on vocabulary across ES and ENNI read alouds, findings suggest that Ms. C attended to a larger subset of vocabulary targets in storybooks than in informational books of the same language. For example, in the ES genre, Ms. C attended to more abstract nouns, used more metalanguage around the discussion of nouns, and referred to more adjective/adverbs. Instead, in the ENNI genre, Ms. C attended to a greater number of concrete nouns and verbs, but made much less reference to metalanguage and did not discuss abstract nouns or adjective/adverbs at all. This seems to indicate that Ms. C’s instruction around vocabulary differed across genres of books, in that she discussed specific types of vocabulary targets in storybooks and specific types in informational genres of books.

Although Ms. C used a similar number of instructional strategies in ES than ENNI read alouds to attend to vocabulary, there were differences in the frequency to which Ms. C implemented different instructional strategies across these genres. In the ES session, Ms. C supported students’ understanding of vocabulary by explaining words to students, prompting vocabulary explanations from children, and clarifying/reinforcing students’ text-related answers. In the ENNI activity, Ms. C implemented these same strategies but much less frequently, with the exception of employing the instructional practice of emphasizing the text, which was unique to the ENNI session. These results show that
there was much more explanation of vocabulary and more opportunities for children to provide vocabulary explanations during the time in which Ms. C was reading an ES book than ENNI book. This may be explained by the fact that Ms. C attended to a range of different vocabulary targets which may have required that Ms. C provide different levels of scaffolding or students to understand. For example, Ms. C may have needed to provide more explanation of abstract nouns, which was a prevalent target in the ES read aloud. On the other hand, she may not have felt this was as necessary in the ENNI genre since the most prevalent vocabulary target was concrete nouns.

Explaining concrete nouns. Findings revealed that concrete nouns were attended to in both genres, but was given more attention in the ENNI read aloud. Moreover, the most prevalent strategy used by Ms. C in English target language read alouds when comparing across genre was explaining vocabulary. This section provides an analysis of the discourse features that lie behind Ms. C’s attempts to explain concrete nouns in an effort to document similarities and differences in the functionality of her practices in ES and ENNI sessions.

Ms. C explained concrete nouns in both read alouds using both wh-clause interrogative statements (e.g., What does that whispering mean?; What does it mean an [sic] unicycle?) as well as declarative statements (e.g., It only has one wheel; That’s what whispering [means]) to reinforce and support the explanation of the concrete nouns that resulted from these questions. Contrary to the findings around abstract nouns, to aid her in explaining the meaning of these words in either the ES or ENNI setting. Ms. C generally used an unmarked theme then referred back to the concrete noun being explained, and in both read alouds, referred to that word using a referent rather than
stating the actual name of the concrete vocabulary word (e.g., This is a boat made out of newspaper; It has only one.). In both read alouds, she also used predominantly relational processes and did not use complex sentences joined by logical connectors to explain the meaning of these words. This indicates that the explanation of the concrete nouns were straightforward in nature, whereby Ms. C equated the vocabulary word with its definition and did not use or require the use of complex sentences to provide that meaning (e.g., It only has one wheel; That’s what whispering [means]). Thus, Ms. C’s discourse features were similar across ES and ENNI genres with regards to this particular instructional strategy and target.

**Print Knowledge Instruction**

Ms. C attended to more than twice the number of print knowledge targets in ES read alouds than she did in ENNI read alouds. Moreover, these targets were differentially distributed across specific print knowledge aspects. For example, Ms. C addressed the act of reading/writing and book parts/vocabulary of books more prominently in the ES, but attended to the act of referencing illustrations equally across ES and ENNI genres. These results suggest that Ms. C attended to the act of referencing illustrations in both genres, but discussed the act of reading/writing and vocab of books primarily in the narrative genre.

There was variation in the instructional strategies that Ms. C used to navigate these print knowledge targets. For example, while Ms. C was most likely to highlight print knowledge targets by segwaying to reading in the ES read aloud, she was most likely to prompt students to refer to the illustrations in ENNI. In both activities, Ms. C
encouraged students to provide illustration descriptions, which was expected given that Ms. C also paid equal attention across sessions to the act of referencing illustrations. The results show that Ms. C called children’s attention to print knowledge targets in differential ways in the two genres of books, except for prompting illustration descriptions, which she did regardless of the difference of genre.

**Prompts illustration descriptions in the act of referencing the illustration.** In both genres, Ms. C encouraged children to describe the illustration when engaged in the act of referencing the picture. This section provides an analysis of the discourse features that lie beneath Ms. C’s attempts to have children describe those pictures as a way in which to model the act of referencing the illustration. Below I highlight the similarities and differences in the ways in which she implemented these practices across ES and ENNI activities.

Ms. C prompted illustration descriptions through wh-clause interrogative questions in both the ES and ENNI genres, however in the ES read aloud, Ms. C specifically asked “what” the children were seeing (e.g., What’s the bunny doing?) while she asked questions about specific characters (e.g., Who’s missing some teeth here?) in the ENNI read aloud. Ms. C also asked a fill-in-the-blank type of “what question in the ENNI genre (e.g., So look at her or him actually, he has no what?). The themes of the questions were unmarked in the ES session, meaning that each began with the focal question word “what”, however Ms. C did use a vocative to call on a specific child (e.g., What is the bunny doing here, Ryan?). In contrast, Ms. C used a conjunctive adjunct “so” to connect this statement to the previous information that was shared about the book and
to signal to children that Ms. C was about to summarize or review the information with children (e.g., So look at her or him actually, he has no what?).

Ms. C prompted children to describe the illustration in a uniform manner in ES, since in each question she asked children to look at and describe the behavioral processes that the character was engaged in (e.g., doing). Instead, in the ENNI genre, Ms. C asked about the material and relational processes having to do with the characters (e.g. missing, having). In both activities, Ms. C did not use logical connectors to form complex sentences when prompting children to describe the illustration. Thus, in general, the way that Ms. C asked children to describe the illustration in the ES session followed a uniform pattern with similar discourse features used across questions, whereas in the ENNI read aloud, Ms. C used more variable discourse features, reflected in the wh-clauses, theme, and processes, to prompt children’s illustration descriptions.

Translanguaging. There were more instances of translanguaging in the ENNI session than the ES session. While the translanguaging occurred at various points and for various reasons during the read aloud, one similarity that was found across genres in English was for Ms. C to translanguage in order to make book-to-life connections for children. There were many similarities in the translanguaging events across the ES and ENNI read alouds, such as the topics that were discussed and the children with whom Ms. C was talking. The following excerpts showcase the similarities and differences in how Ms. C forged a book-to-life connection by translanguaging in the ES and ENNI read alouds.

English storybook read aloud

1 Ms. C: Have [sic] your brother cried before like that, like Louis?
Ernesto: Yeah.

Ms. C: Yes? Uy. And what does your mommy do? Se dice Gordo ya deja de llorar. [She says stop crying Gordo?]

Ernesto: Si. [Yes]

Ms. C: Si? Y se calla gordo? [Yes? And Gordo quiets down?]

Ernesto: No. [No.]

Ms. C: Llora y llora y llora? [He cries and he cries and he cries?]

Ernesto: And he keeps on crying my little brother.

**English Nonnarrative Informational read aloud, excerpt 1**

Ms. C: He’s missing some more teeth. Where-- We all gonna-that’s going to happen to all of us. Our tooth is going to fall and then we’ll grow new ones. Pero, nos tenemos trece-[But, we have thirteen] (Ernesto shows his teeth). Muestrelo Ernesto. [Show it Ernesto] Ernesto ya perdió un diente. [Ernesto already lost a tooth].

**English Nonnarrative Informational read aloud, excerpt 2**

Aaron: I, once I, once I, want to fall down and then one, and one side

Alex swallow one (the child is pointing to his teeth).

Ms. C: Ah! Tu hermano, verdad? [Your brother, right?] Se está cambiando los dientes porque ya su hermano es un poco más grande. [He is changing his teeth because now his brother is a little older] So then let’s see what happened.
Ms. C’s instructional strategy in all three excerpts involved book-to-life connections for children, however in the ES genre, Ms. C asked questions to prompt children to make this type of connection for themselves (e.g., Y se calla gordo? [And Gordo quiets down?]), while in the ENNI genre, Ms. C used statements (e.g., Pero nos tenemos trece [But we have thirteen]), rhetorical questions (e.g., Tu hermano, verdad? [Your brother, right?]), and commands (e.g., Muestrelo Ernesto [Show it Ernesto]) to forge these connections for children.

Ms. C does not use modality in any of her translanguging, which seems to be strategic given that she is stating facts and thus does not want to moderate the certainty of her statements (e.g., Llora y llora y llora? [He cries and cries and cries?]; Ernesto ya perdió un diente [Ernesto already lost a tooth]). The processes used when Ms. C translanguaged were mostly behavioral in nature given that Ms. C’s purpose was to forge a book-to-life connection and thus, was talking about events that the child either had experienced, could experience, or will experience in relation to the topic of the book. Similarly, the theme of Ms. C’s phrases when translanguaging represents the children or their family members as the subjects, and thus the foci, of the sentence.

Ms. C’s use of conjunctions in her translanguaging differs across the ES and ENNI read alouds, since in Spanish she used “y” [and] to extend and connect the story of Ernesto’s brother (e.g. Y se calla gordo? [And Gordo quiets down?; Llora y llora y llora? [He cries and cries and cries?]), whereas in the ENNI setting, she used causal conjunctions to explain facts around the process of growing teeth (e.g. Se está cambiando los dientes porque ya su hermano es un poco más grande [He is changing his teeth because now his brother is a little older]), and negative extension types of conjunctions,
such as “but” to juxtapose information in two different parts of the teeth-growing process (e.g., Pero, nos tenemos trece [But we have thirteen). The use of these conjunctions in her translanguaging practices aligns with the larger global structures of the book genre that she is reading in each session.

There were also some unique ways in which Ms. C translanguaged in each genre. In the ES reading, Ms. C translanguaged by using Spanish to ask a child a question about his family that related to the Oonga Boonga storyline (e.g., And what does your mommy do? Se dice Gordo ya dejar llorar [sic]?), restating the child’s response (e.g., Si? Y se calla gordo? [Yes? And Gordo quiets down?]), and expanding on the child’s response (e.g., No? Llora y llora y llora? [He cries and cries and cries?]). Instead, in the ENNI activity, Ms. C translanguaged in order to signal the end of the storybook (e.g., Muy bien, ahora…va a ser nos amigo el dentist [Very good, now…it will be our friend the dentist]) and to call children’s attention to the fact that she was going to switch target languages (e.g., Ms. C XX una historia X en ingles pero ahora ya seguemos en espanol [Ms. C XX a story X in English but now we will continue in Spanish]).

A Comparison of Teacher’s Discourse in Instructional Strategies and Targets during Spanish Storybook and Spanish Informational Book Readings

Vocabulary Instruction

When comparing Ms. C’s focus on vocabulary across SS and SNNI read alouds, the results showed that Ms. C attended to the same vocabulary targets in each read aloud, except for abstract nouns, which Ms. C only discussed in the SS genre. Similar to the
findings when comparing instructional practices in English storybook and informational genres, adjective/adverbs and the use of metalanguage around vocabulary were more prominently discussed by Ms. C in the storybook genre, while concrete nouns were attended to mostly in the informational genre. Verbs were equally addressed in both read alouds.

There was variation in the frequency to which Ms. C implemented similar instructional strategies across SS and SNNI read alouds. Ms. C favored the instructional strategy of emphasizing the text to draw students’ attention to vocabulary targets in the SS genre, whereas she used an equal variety of three strategies in the SNNI genre, including explaining vocabulary, emphasizing the text, and clarifying/reinforcing students’ text-related answers. Together, the results show that there may have been more support for students’ vocabulary target learning in the SNNI read aloud because Ms. C implemented a variety of instructional strategies around vocabulary rather than relying on emphasizing the text alone, as she did in the SS read aloud. However, Ms. C did not integrate instructional strategies around vocabulary in either SS or SNNI genres that encouraged students’ oral participation, and thus, these aspects of the read alouds, regardless of genre, were more teacher-centered than student-centered.

**Explaining concrete nouns.** Concrete nouns were attended to more frequently in the informational genre, however they also were the most prevalent vocabulary target in both the SS and SNNI activities. Moreover, while different instructional strategies were prevalent in the SS and SNNI genres, Ms. C was shown to explain vocabulary in both. This section provides an analysis of the discourse features that lie behind Ms. C’s
attempts to emphasize concrete nouns in which I discuss the similarities and differences in the ways in which she implemented these practices across SS and SNNI read alouds.

Similar to the pattern of findings across ES and ENNI genres, Ms. C used the same discourse features to explain concrete nouns in SS and SNNI read alouds. In both sessions, Ms. C used declarative statements to explain these words. Each of these statements contained unmarked themes which represented the focal word that Ms. C was defining and explaining. For the most part, and in contrast to the findings in ES and ENNI activities, Ms. C was careful to state the actual vocabulary word that she was defining rather than using a referent as a placeholder for the label (e.g., Los vecinos [the neighbors], un flamenco [a flamingo], una bosteza [a yawn]).

Another similarity in the way Ms. C explained concrete nouns across genres in Spanish was that in each statement, relational processes were used to equate the vocabulary word with its definition (e.g., los vecinos son...[the neighbors are]; Bostezar significa...[to yawn means]; Un flamenco son [sic]...[a flamingo are]). Ms. C also used a similar logical connector “que” [that] with each statement in order to elaborate on the definitions that Ms. C was providing for each word. For example, the information following the use of “que”[that] typically described the focal concrete noun in additional ways (e.g., Los vecinos son las personas que viven cerca de nosotros [the neighbors; Un flamenco son [sic] esas pajaros que tienen patas largas [A flamingo are those parrots that have large feet]). Thus, Ms. C’s discourse features showed to be similar with regards to explaining concrete nouns even though she was doing so across different genres. When comparing the explanation of concrete nouns across genres in English and Spanish (i.e.,
ES & ENNI vs. SS & SNNI), there showed to be more cross-language differences, regardless of genre, more so than cross genre differences, regardless of language.

Print Knowledge Instruction

Ms. C attended to almost four times the number of print knowledge targets in SS read alouds than she did in SNNI read alouds. Although the same print knowledge targets were represented in both SS and SNNI genres, which included the act of reading/writing, the act of referencing illustrations, and book parts/vocab of books, Ms. C attended to each target more often in the SS read aloud than the SNNI read aloud.

Ms. C used similar instructional strategies across SS and SNNI read alouds to teach children about print knowledge targets, however there was a much greater frequency of instructional strategies in the SS genre than SNNI genre. In the storybook setting, Ms. C prompted children to learn about print knowledge mostly by prompting them to refer to the illustration and by segwaying to reading. Other less prominent techniques that Ms. C used in the SS activity included prompting children to refer to the illustration and asking students to describe the illustration. Ms. C also asked children in the SNNI activity to describe the illustration, but she implemented the other strategies, such as prompting children’s reference to the illustration and segwaying to reading, much less than she did in the SS read aloud. These findings may suggest that the SS read aloud was a more supportive context for children to learn about print knowledge targets since Ms. C addressed these targets more frequently and through more frequent use of a variety of instructional strategies.
Describing illustrations during the act of referencing illustrations. This section provides an analysis of the discourse features that support Ms. C’s description of illustrations when referencing the picture. I discuss the similarities and differences in the ways in which she implemented this practice across SS and SNNI read alouds. With regards to the print knowledge-based target of referencing the illustrations, Ms. C described these illustrations in both the SS and SNNI genres, although with more frequency in the SS read aloud.

There was a noticeable difference in the way that Ms. C described illustrations, and thus modeled the act of referencing illustrations, in the SS and SNNI read alouds. In terms of mood, Ms. C used both commands and statements in the SS activity (e.g., El niño esta saltando [the child is jumping]; Mira como viene el aroma [Look how the aroma is coming]) and mostly commands in the SNNI activity (e.g., Mira como hace como un cangrejo asi [Look how he is acting like a crab like that]) in order to orient students’ attention to the picture and to describe different features of the illustration. Ms. C did not use modals in either genre to describe the illustrations, and the themes of both the statements and the commands were generally unmarked, meaning that Ms. C initiated commands with a verb (e.g., mira [look], vieron [they saw]) and initiated statements with the names of the characters that she was describing in the illustrations (e.g. toda la familia [all the family], ello [he]).

A range of processes were used to describe the actions, events, or scenes that Ms. C was describing in the SS and SNNI activities and similar processes were used across these contexts, regardless of the differences in genre. For example, Ms. C described the illustrations in both activities using material processes to describe action (e.g., Mira
como…[Look how]; Salta como…[Jump like]) and behavioral processes to describe behavior (e.g., Todo el mundo compartieron… [Everyone shared]; Hace como un…[He acts like a ]). In both sessions, Ms. C used conjunctions to form complex statements when describing the illustrations. In both the SS and SNNI genres, she elaborated on her phrases to add information to her description, however in the SS read aloud, the information that she added described character actions related to the story events (e.g. Mira como viene el aroma [Look how the aroma is coming], Y vieron como todos compartieron la sopa [And did you see how everyone shared the soup]), whereas the information that she added in the SNNI read aloud described character actions related to the focal topic of the book (e.g. Salta como una rana [He jumps like a frog], Mira como hace como un cangrejo asi [Look how he acts like a crab like that]). Thus, there were many similar discourse features in teacher’s extratextual talk when describing illustrations in Spanish read alouds, regardless of the genre. Although there was a slight difference of focus in Ms. C’s illustration descriptions across different genres in Spanish (e.g., sentences were elaborated around narrative features in SS and topical features in SNNI), for the most part, Ms. C approached the task of describing the illustration in Spanish similarly for storybooks and informational books.

**Translanguaging.** There were many more instances of translanguaging in Spanish read alouds than English read alouds. A unique finding that emerged with regards to Ms. C’s translanguaging practices across English and Spanish contexts was that in the English read alouds, Ms. C did not use Spanish for management purposes, while in Spanish read alouds, management of behavior was the most common reason for Ms. C to translanguage. When comparing within Spanish language read alouds, Ms. C
translanguaged more frequently in the storybook reading than in the nonnarrative informational read aloud. However, when comparing the instances of translanguaging, outside of those that were management-related, for the most part, Ms. C used translanguaging in both SS and SNNI genres to clarify or reinforce students’ English statements or responses by restating or recasting them in Spanish. The following excerpts showcase the similarities and differences in how Ms. C clarified or reinforced students’ answers by translanguaging in the SS and SNNI activities.

**Spanish storybook read aloud**

1. Erman: Hey, Ms. C. Ms. C, he’s sad. {Moves toward the book and points at character on the page.}

2. Ms. C: Ella está triste. [She is sad] {to Erman} ¿Porque ella esta triste, Erman? [Why is she sad, Erman?]

3. Erman: Because he likes flowers.


**Spanish Nonnarrative Informational read aloud**

1. Student: Ah it looks like a dolphin! {Reacts to the page that Ms. C is holding up which has a picture of a dolphin or whale-looking fish mammal}
In both excerpts, Ms. C is responding to a child’s English statement and recasts the statement into Spanish. When translanguaging, Ms. C mimics the mood of the child’s statement, unless reinforcing with a rhetorical statement (e.g., Porque le gusta las flores? [Why does she like the flowers?]), and models the way in which the statement might be said in Spanish. In terms of Ms. C’s recast in the SS genre, she corrects the child by changing the “he” to “she”, but maintains similar sentence structure in the rest of the sentence (e.g., Ella esta triste [She is sad]; Porque le gusta las flores? [Why does she like the flowers?]). In contrast, in the SNNI activity, Ms. C models the way in which the child’s English statement might be said in Spanish highlighting the difference of the material process “looks” for the behavioral process “ves” and the switching the positions of the verb and the direct object (e.g. it looks like vs. lo ves como). Since Ms. C is merely restating or recasting the children’s statements in Spanish, she does not include any modals and does not elaborate any of the phrases by adding a logically-connected secondary clause.

Ms. C also translanguaged in the SS genre in order to support students’ ability to think about and respond to prediction-types of questions. In each instance, Ms. C would ask the question first in Spanish, repeat the question several times, and then translate and repeat the question in English. The excerpt below demonstrates this pattern.
Ms. C: ¿Ah? Ella le preguntó a su mamá eso. ¿Porque creen que ella va
utilizar una pala grande? [She asks her mother this. Why do you think she
is going to use a big shovel? {Points toward illustration.} ¿Y la señora
Gourmerie usa una pala más pequeña? ¿Quien me puede decir algo? ¿Ah?
¿Porque creen? [And Mrs. Gourmerie uses a smaller sovel? Who can tell
me something? {to Kyle} Kyle, why do you think she uses a big shovel,
and she used a little one? {Points at illustration.} Why do you think that?

Ms. C may have chosen to translanguage specifically for Kyle, who was an
English-dominant child. Since Ms. C had prompted children several times to make a
prediction and had not yet received a response, she may have used English as a way to
scaffold the linguistic challenge of the question for Kyle, who as an English-dominant
child, may have needed more support in understanding what Ms. C was asking. Ms. C
translates her question word-for-word and also translates the other prompts and repeats it
(e.g., Why do you think that?) in the manner she had done in Spanish.

Thus, Ms. C’s translanguaging practices were used in conjunction with different
instructional strategies in English read alouds and Spanish read alouds. While Ms. C
translanguaged for different reasons across English and Spanish read alouds, there were
several prevalent functions of translanguaging that were common to the storybook and
informational genre readings in English, which included making book-to-life connections
in Spanish.
CHAPTER FIVE: THE NATURE OF ONE DUAL LANGUAGE TEACHER’S DISCOURSE FEATURES ACROSS STORYBOOK AND NONNARRATIVE INFORMATIONAL GENRES IN SPANISH AND ENGLISH

In this chapter, I present the findings on the nature of Ms. C’s discourse features in Spanish and English language read alouds. I provide a description of the discourse features in Ms. C’s speech and an analysis of the similarities and differences across English and Spanish storybook read alouds and English and Spanish informational book read alouds. The sections are divided by the five focal microstructures, namely mood, modality, process, theme, and taxis. In each section, I describe the trends that emerged in English storybook read alouds, Spanish storybook read alouds, English nonnarrative informational read alouds, and Spanish nonnarrative informational read alouds, with excerpts from the text to support my discussion and analysis of the findings.

Mood

**English storybook read alouds.** Through mood, we can identify the relationship that is set up between Ms. C and the students. In the ES genre, a distinct pattern emerged in terms of the interaction between Ms. C and the students when analyzing for mood. Ms. C asked a question, and then reinforced the child’s answer through a statement. This was a recursive pattern that took place throughout the read aloud, such that there was an interplay of declarative and interrogative mood choices. For the most part, Ms. C’s questions served to request students’ participation in recalling the text (e.g., Who’s the one helping the baby after the mom?) which aligned with the fact that Ms. C was conducting a repeated reading of the book “Oonga Boonga”. Her statements were used to clarify and reinforce the students’ responses, which she often recasted in statement form.
(e.g., All the cats waked [sic] up and all the dogs too. You’re right Dwight.). In this activity, Ms. C did not use any commands and thus did not enforce or instruct children to engage with the book in any particular manner. Thus, the interpersonal relationship between Ms. C and the students in the ES genre was one where Ms. C requested information from students in an effort to engage them in the process of summarizing and co-constructing the events of the text, but did so through the use of closed questions, which controlled the type and amount of information that students were able to impart.

**Spanish storybook read alouds.** Ms. C’s mood in the SS session seemed similar to that of ES in that Ms. C also engaged mostly in an interplay of declarative and interrogative mood choices. However, these moods served different functions than those of the ES session. Ms. C predominantly used statements to summarize the text for the children instead of using questions that prompted students to summarize the text as was the case in the ES genre (e.g., Ellos tienen una enorme manguera [They have an enormous hose]). Rather, questions in the SS activity were asked by Ms. C to prompt students to make predictions about what would occur in the text or to prompt them to make other inferences around the text (e.g., Porque creen que ella va utilizar una pala grande? [Why do you think she is going to use a big shovel?]). There were more commands in this read aloud whereby Ms. C directed students’ attention to the illustrations, instructed them to show her elements of the pictures, or instructed them to share their questions or comments (e.g., Mira como viene el aroma [Look how the aroma is coming?]). Thus the interpersonal relationship between Ms. C and the students in the SS read aloud was one where Ms. C also requested a lot of information from students, but prioritized those requests towards predicting and inferencing around story events. Ms. C
also took a more directive role in this activity because she summarized and described what the children should be understanding from the text and used commands to direct students attention to specific areas of the book - a phenomenon which did not occur in the ES genre.

**English nonnarrative informational read alouds.** Ms. C enacted a very directive role when engaging in the ENNI read aloud. Through using an interplay of all three types of moods when pausing from reading the text, her discourse was functional in enforcing her authority in the read aloud and closely guiding students’ engagement with the text. Ms. C’s questions usually comprised of asking students to fill-in-the-word at the end of her sentences so as to constrain the way in which she had students construct and recap the text (e.g., He has no teeth so he cannot…?). It was common for Ms. C to ask a string of questions that transitioned from more open-ended versions of questions to closed questions (e.g., That’s why, what? What do we have to do? Do we have to take care of our teeth?) - another technique that she used to control the manner and extent to which students participated. Ms. C used statements to summarize the text (e.g., They’re losing set number two), to clarify/reinforce students’ fill-in-the-blank responses, and to point out aspects of the text that were similar to children’s lived experiences (e.g., So like Aaron’s brother, he lost a tooth, Aaron said, but another one grew). Ms. C used more commands in this genre than in the storybook genre, and she implemented these in order to instruct children to look at the illustrations, provide real-life examples aligned with the topic of the text, and take note of certain pieces of information.

**Spanish nonnarrative informational read alouds.** In the SNNI session, there was also an interplay between all three types of moods but Ms. C took on a less directive
role than that found in the ENNI read aloud. For example, instead of forging connections for students, as was the case in the ENNI read aloud, Ms. C asked questions that encouraged children to make their own book-to-life connections (e.g., Y cuando tú te mueves que hace tu sombra? [And when you move what does your shadow do?]). However, similar to the ENNI session, Ms. C still constrained students’ opportunities to recap the text by prompting them to fill-in-the-word at the end of her sentences (e.g., Y él está pensando que su sombra es un…? [And he is thinking what his shadow is a…?]). Statements were used by Ms. C in this genre to clarify/reinforce students’ summaries of the text but also to define and explain text-based concepts. Ms. C also frequently used commands to prompt children to look at illustrations and to listen to her (e.g., Mira reflejo en los lentes del sol…del salvavidas [Look at the reflection in the sunglasses…of the lifevest]). Thus, although she constrained and controlled the way that students summarized the text in similar ways to the ENNI read aloud, comparatively, she provided more opportunity for children’s extended productive engagement around their own book-to-life connections.

Modality

**English storybook read alouds.** The use of modals allows a speaker to express different attitudes and judgments with regard to their message. In the ES read aloud, most usage of modality was found during instances when Ms. C was managing students’ behavior. Through modals of inclination, such as the use of “can”, and modals of obligation, such as the use of “need to”, Ms. C directed and advised children to behave in certain ways that would enable her to continue reading without interruption. (e.g., I
cannot read the story until you go back a little bit). In relation to reading the book, Ms. C was found to emphasize particular modals in the text, specifically those which were inclination-based, that were central to the emerging story line and students’ understanding of concept development in the story. (e.g., Nobody could [make baby Louise stop crying]).

Ms. C was also found to use a range of modals when explaining figurative language and defining abstract nouns. The following excerpt from the English storybook read aloud of Oonga Boonga showcases the way in which Ms. C used modals to explain the meaning of an abstract noun in the ES read aloud. In this example, Ms. C has stopped reading from the book, having come across the word “advice”, and has asked students about the meaning of advice. After hearing some different definitions from students, Ms. C provides an explanation of her own, in which she used several different modals and mood adjuncts.

Raquel: When, XXX you have to clean up and it’s messy, they have to clean up and that’s something to do.

Ms. C: Well an advice is not really\(^{(a)}\) telling you what to do in that way. It tells\(^{(b)}\) you what to do, like a tip. Like I think you should clean\(^{(c)}\) the table with soap, because when you use soap it helps you to remove all the dirt on the table. And then I say Oh, I’m going to try\(^{(d)}\) that but it’s not telling\(^{(e)}\) me go\(^{(f)}\) and clean\(^{(g)}\) the table with soap! It’s not like that, it’s an advice. It’s telling me what to do that could be\(^{(h)}\) -- let’s see what the advice we hear - - the neighbors, the neighbors said.
Ms. C initiates her explanation by suggesting that the previous student’s definition was incorrect. Rather than stating this explicitly, Ms. C used the modal adjunct “really” (a) - an expression of intensification - to communicate in a more subtle way that the definition of advice does not align with the child’s explanation. Ms. C contrasts her use of the modal adjunct “really” with a subsequent modal-free phrase (b) in order to relay with a high level of certainty the actual definition of advice. In an effort to expand upon this, she mimics an interaction in which one person is giving advice to another person, and used the modal of necessity “should” (c) to showcase the nuanced connotation of advice whereby one person strongly recommends a particular path of action to another. She continues to mimic the interaction, showing that the person expresses high inclination through the modal “going to” (d) but that this high inclination does not equate with absolute certainty as in the modal-free examples “go” (f) and “clean” (g). She ends her explanation by reinforcing her original definition of the word advice and relating it to the modal of inclination “could be” (h), reinforcing that it is a suggestion and not a command. Thus Ms. C’s use of modals in the ES session was strategic in explaining the nuanced meaning of abstract nouns, figurative language, and in directing and obligating children to behave in certain ways.

**Spanish storybook read alouds.** Ms. C’s usage of modality in the SS genre was more frequent and varied than that of the ES read aloud. Given that Ms. C was conducting the initial reading of the SS text, she asked students a large number of prediction questions, all of which included the use of probability modals in order to prompt students to think of potential subsequent events (e.g., Que creen que va pasar?
[What do you think is going to happen?]). As a follow up to many of these prediction questions, Ms. C also used modals of obligation to prompt students to justify their predictions (e.g., Que te hace decir eso? [What makes you say that?]). In using this modal, the construction of her question prompted students not just to reflect about why they responded in a particular way, but to think about what text or illustration-based evidence encouraged them to do so. Thus, the use of this modal added a nuanced meaning on to the justification question, which may have scaffolded and helped students to reason through the question. Ms. C also used modals of probability to inform students when she was about to continue reading from the text (e.g., Vamos a ver qué pasa [Let’s see what happens]).

While modal usage in the SS read aloud differed from the ES read aloud in these ways, there were some key similarities across genres. One such parallel was Ms. C’s use of modals to manage students’ behavior during the activity. To this end, Ms. C used probability modals to instruct students on ways that she expected them to behave during the read aloud (e.g., Vamos a sentarnos [Let’s sit]), and modals of obligation to remind students of behaviors that she did not concede (e.g., No tienes que jugar [You don’t have play]). Also, similar to the pattern found in the ES genre, the Spanish storybook that Ms. C was reading included various modals throughout the text. As such, Ms. C highlighted some of these modal verbs and their subtle meanings in her extratextual talk, especially when the modal contributed to a concept that was important in the developing storyline (e.g., Los vecinos utilizan unas regaderas verdes pequeñas y ellas tienen que utilizar una enorme manguera [The neighbors use a small, green watering can and they have to use an enormous hose]). Ms. C’s use of modals helped her to model and direct students around
the act of reading and to highlight how modals were being used in the text to convey nuanced meaning.

**English nonnarrative informational read alouds.** In contrast with the SNNI book, the book that Ms. C read in the ENNI read aloud contained many modals of probability that were used to talk about the attributes and characteristics events around teeth (e.g., Our tooth is going to fall and then we’ll grow new ones) and modals of obligation that were used to talk about preservation of teeth (e.g., You need to take care of those molars…). Ms. C integrated similar types of modals in her extratextual talk in these sections to highlight this factual information (e.g., There’s a lot of things you cannot eat if you don’t have teeth) and to make clear to children the ways that they would experience these events in their own lives (e.g., That’s going to happen to all of us). Since there was more usage of modals in the text, this seemed to encourage Ms. C to also use modals in her speech so as to reinforce the messages in similar ways for children.

The difference in frequency of modal usage between ENNI and SNNI books may have originated from the nature of the focal topic in each book. The SNNI book discussed shadows but limited this discussion to focusing on the number of different animal-shaped shadows and the characteristics of those shadows that one boy could make. Instead, the ENNI book was directed around discussing the events related to the origin, growth, use, and preservation of teeth, and thus more modals were used because it was necessary for the author to set up hypothetical situations and talk about the past and present when depicting the growth cycle of teeth. The findings showed that in either case, Ms. C included a similar amount of modals in her discussion as were featured in the book that she was reading. Thus, modals in the ENNI book functioned to allow the author to
discuss more technical aspects of the informational topic, and these modals were mirrored in Ms. C’s speech in order to enable her to navigate this technical information for children.

**Spanish nonnarrative informational read alouds.** Similar to the pattern of modal usage in the ES genre, in the SNNI read aloud, Ms. C used modals predominantly in preparation to read the text. She used mostly probability-based modals to organize and prepare the environment so that her reading of the text is accessible to all the children (e.g., Te voy montar las fotos y todo el mundo va a tener la oportunidad de ver las fotos [I will show you the photos and everyone will have the opportunity to see the photos]).

With regard to the informational genre, no modals were used within the text of the book. Ms. C was not found to highlight modals in the ways that she did in the English and Spanish storybook genre or in the ENNI activity. One instance, however, in which Ms. C was found to use modals was when generalizing the topic of the book, on shadows, to children’s real life experiences with shadows. When asking children about different attributes of a shadow according to their experiences with their own shadow, she wavered between using modals of probability to question students on possible attributes (e.g., Y todo el tiempo, podemos ver nuestra sombra? [And can we see our shadow all the time?]) and modals of obligation to question and suggest necessary attributes of shadows (e.g., Que hace falta para poder ver la sombra? [What is needed in order to see a shadow?]).

Thus, the pattern with regard to Ms. C’s modal usage in the SNNI read aloud showed that modals, as a tool with which to create nuanced meaning and to express attitudes and judgment, were not used in the SNNI text and thus, were not introduced in extratextual discussion by Ms. C. This aligned with the findings of the storybook genre
and the ENNI activity, where Ms. C highlighted modals that were found in the text, particularly when they contributed to the central storyline in storybooks and when they enabled discussion around characteristic attributes and events in informational texts.

**Process**

*English storybook read alouds.* Material processes were the most prevalent clauses in the English storybook and in Ms. C’s extra-textual talk. Ms. C used material verbs to describe how the “actor”, or constituent of the clause who performs the action, was directing their actions towards other participants towards a certain goal. In the ES genre, Ms. C represented mostly characters from the story as the “actors”, who usually acted upon a “beneficiary”, or a participant to whom something was given or for whom something was done. In this case, Louise, the baby in the story frequently appeared as the “beneficiary” in both the text (e.g., He rocked her gently..) and in Ms. C’s extratextual talk (e.g., The grandma is helping her). Ms. C’s purpose for using material processes matched the function of these clauses in the ES text. Thus, Ms. C represented the actions, actors, and participants in her extratextual discussion in similar ways as the text.

Ms. C used many more mental verbs in her extratextual discussion than the number represented in the ES text. This indicated that Ms. C encouraged mental reactions from children in relation to the characters and events in the story, rather than indicating that the text was describing characters’ cognitive, affective, or perceptual reactions. More specifically, Ms. C encouraged more perceptive engagement (e.g., Can you see more water than that?) and cognitive engagement (e.g. Who remembers the name of the brother?) than affective engagement from the children.
In terms of behavioral processes, these are used in the book to describe the behaviors of the crying child and are picked up by Ms. C when talking about those behaviors and what is being experienced by the characters (e.g., So she was crying too much). There are more behavioral processes used in Ms. C’s extratextual talk because she prompts children to talk about the baby’s experiences (e.g., She’s going to cry again, you think Dwight?) or their similar experiences (e.g., Have [sic] your brother cried before like that, like Louis?).

There was a similar number of verbal processes in the text as in Ms. C’s extratextual utterances. Ms. C mostly used verbal processes to remind students what was said between characters in the book (e.g., You see, they said do this, do that but just to try) and to mimic interactions that served as a way to explain the meanings of abstract nouns (e.g., And then I say Oh, I’m going to try that but it’s not telling me go and clean the table with soap!).

Existential processes, which posit that an entity or experience exists through the use of the “there is/are” construction, were not used in the book or by Ms. C in the ES read aloud. Instead, most relational processes used by Ms. C were attributive in nature and functioned to assign a quality (e.g., Louise was smiling from ear to ear) or classification (e.g., Do you think the river was a river?) to a participant. There were a few identifying relational processes used by Ms. C to define the meaning of words (e.g., No, so that means that she was crying a lot). There were found to be many more relational processes in Ms. C’s extratextual utterance than in the book. This is because Ms. C was focused on discussing and highlighting different qualities and descriptions of the
characters at a higher frequency than the book, and also defining different words from the text.

**Spanish storybook read alouds.** Similar to the ES genre, material processes were the most prevalent processes in the text and in Ms. C’s extratextual talk in the SS read aloud. Ms. C used material verbs to describe the deeds performed by the “actor”, which she usually represented as the characters in the story who were mostly acting upon objects that related to the storyline, such as “vegetales” [vegetables], “flores” [flowers], “sopa” [soup], “manguera” [hose] (e.g., Todo el mundo compartieron la sopa y las flores [Everyone shared the soup and the flowers]). In this genre, there were few “beneficiaries”, or participants to whom something was given or from whom something was done, except for the end of the story when characters were shown to be sharing their goods (e.g., Los vecinos les dieron flores y ellas les dieron sopa [The neighbors gave them flowers and they gave them soup]). Thus, Ms. C represented the ways in which the text showcased acts upon the characters in her extratextual discussion of the events.

There was a much higher number of mental processes integrated into the Spanish storybook than the English storybook and there was also more frequent integration of mental processes in Ms. C’s extratextual talk in the SS activity as compared to the ES activity. The proportion of mental processes in the book as compared to that of Ms. C’s speech was similar to the proportion found in the ES genre. This meant that Ms. C prompted children to engage with the text through mostly cognitive reactions (e.g. ¿Qué creen que va pasar en esta historia? [What do you think will happen in this story?]), and perception-based reactions (e.g., Y vieron como todos compartieron la sopa.[And did you
see how everyone shared the soup?). There were very few instances whereby Ms. C encouraged children to react affectively to the text.

While there were an equal amount of behavioral processes in the SS book as there were in Ms. C’s extratextual talk, there was a large difference in the range of behavioral processes that were used. The book offered a great variety of behavior clauses (e.g., bailar [dance], reír [laugh], sonreír [smile], crecer [grow], comer [eat], saborear [taste], vivir [live], torcer [twist]), however the behavioral processes used by Ms. C were almost exclusively those prompting students to look at the illustrations (e.g., Mira Tomi, y es es su mama [Look at Tomi, and this is his mother]). Thus, Ms. C did not call students’ attention to the behavioral actions of characters in the book by representing those processes in her speech even though the text offered a range of descriptive and expressive behavior-related verbs.

There were found to be a similar number of verbal processes in the SS book and in Ms. C’s discussion of the book. Most verbal processes in the book served the function of quoting and reporting characters’ direct speech (e.g., “Nos dimos cuenta de que estabas cocinando,” nos dijo el señor Fitzgerald… [We realized what you were cooking” Mr. Fitzgerald told us]). Ms. C supported these character-based interactions in the text by using verbal processes to summarize or narrate the interactions that were taking place in the story (e.g., Entonces le dice…So she told her; La mamá respondió porque su vuelta necesita una pala grande para revolverla más [The mother responded that her crop needed a large shovel to turn it more]). She also used verbal processes to have children justify their previous responses to questions (e.g., ¿Qué te hace decir eso, Jonathan? [What makes you say that, Jonathan?]).
Most of the relational processes in the SS book and in Ms. C’s extratextual talk were attributive in nature rather than serving identification purposes. In the text, the relational, attributive processes served to describe objects/concepts (e.g., Unos eran grandes y abultados. Otros eran alargados, verdes y llenos de chichones. Otros eran de un amarillo horrible [Some were big and bulky. Others were long, green, and full of bumps. Others were a horrible yellow]), and classify objects/concepts (e.g., De adonde eran los vegetales? [Where were the vegetables from?]). Similarly, in her extratextual talk, Ms. C also used attributive processes to classify objects/concepts (e.g., ¿Eran chinos o italianos? [Were they Chinese or Italian?]) or assign a quality to characters/objects/concepts (e.g., Ella esta tan triste porque su jardín no era hermoso [She was so sad because her garden was not beautiful]). The few identification-based relational processes that were used in the text were used to define the names of Chinese vegetables (e.g, “Este es un ciao, un guau,” dijo mama [“This is a ciao, a guau” said mother]) and to label an important event in the story (e.g., “Esa fue la mejor de todas las cenas” [That was the best dinner of all]). In a similar manner, Ms. C used identification-based relational processes to define several vocabulary words in the text (e.g., Los vecinos son las personas que viven cerca de nosotros [The neighbors are the people that live close to us]) but did not use these relational processes to talk about the same areas of the text where identification was used. Thus, the analysis of the relational processes used by Ms. C show that they were functional in navigating the text in similar ways to the manner in which the text was written. Existential processes were not used in the book or by Ms. C in the ES activity.
**English nonnarrative informational read alouds.** As was the case in both ES and SS read alouds, material processes were as prevalent in Ms. C’s extratextual speech as they were in the book in the ENNI genre. Many of the “actors” were construed as the children or Ms. C herself through pronouns such as “you” or “I”, and their actions were directed towards a “goal”, or a participant to whom the action is extended, which was usually the object “teeth”, the focal topic of the book (e.g., After that, you will not lose them again hopefully). Similar to the SS session, the material processes were directed towards a “goal” more than a “beneficiary”, although the constituent of “beneficiary” appeared in the linguistic structures of the book (e.g., Don’t break your teeth untangling knots!) and Ms. C’s speech (e.g., You need to take care of those molars…) when the subject of caring for one’s teeth was discussed.

Mental processes were not featured in the ENNI text and were not used often by Ms. C in the ENNI genre. However, the number of behavioral processes used in the book and used by Ms. C during her discussion of the book were similar. Unlike the SS session, the types of behavioral processes that were found in the book (e.g., “I can never smile like Smiling Sam the crocodile”) were also those that were used by Ms. C when discussing the text with the children (e.g., He cannot smile). As such, not only was Ms. C modeling the use of behavioral processes in her discussion about the text, but she was using the same types of behavioral processes when navigating the text for children.

In terms of verbal processes, there were found to be more instances in the book than in Ms. C’s extratextual talk. This is because the book included a variety of verbal processes, given that it quoted direct speech from several different characters throughout the text (e.g., “Clams have no teeth,” says Pam the clam). Rather than support these
interactions in the text by narrating or referencing them, as Ms. C had done in the SS genre, Ms. C used verbal processes to discuss the opportunity to verify the information with the dentist that the children were going to visit after the read aloud (e.g., We’re going to go now to ask the dentist if what we really hear is true. We need to ask him because he’s the expert). Thus, while Ms. C used verbal processes in a different manner than those in the text, she used these features to support a practice that aligned well with the nonnarrative informational genre: the practice of verifying factual information with an expert.

Existential processes were not used in the book or by Ms. C in the ES read aloud. The relational processes in the ENNI book and Ms. C’s extratextual talk served to identify the attributes, values, and possessions of the characters and objects in relation to the topic of teeth. The author of the book used relational processes to describe features of teeth (e.g., They sure are handy when you smile; They are very much in style; They must be very much worthwhile) as well as to describe characters or the reader (e.g., Ruths are toothy; You’re lucky that you have your teeth). In order to build information around the topic of “who has teeth” in the book, the author used relational processes to describe possession on the part of characters (e.g., Clams have no teeth; They say his teeth have fifty fillings) and the reader (e.g., You’re lucky that you have your teeth).

Specifically, Ms. C’s extratextual talk included descriptions of the attributes of teeth (e.g., Those are strong; Those are big ones; That’s a lot), and the attributes related to the function of teeth (e.g., There’s a lot of things you cannot eat if you don’t have teeth; Was that smart?; So it’s not good to bite your dentist). Ms. C also used relational processes to describe the possession of teeth by different characters (e.g., He has no teeth
so he cannot…?; He has two; The one you have now) and, at times, objects (e.g. The pumpkins have different styles of…?). Lastly, relational processes were also used by Ms. C to identify the stage in the teeth losing/growing process (e.g., So that is set two; Set one is the one we have now; Those were the last ones). Thus, Ms. C’s use of relational processes was similar to that of the text since in both cases, relational process were used to describe features and attributes of teeth and to describe character’s possession of teeth.

**Spanish nonnarrative informational read alouds.** Similar to the ES, SS, and ENNI genres, material processes were also equally present in the text and Ms. C’s speech in the SNNI read aloud. Ms. C generally framed the actor of the material process as the children in the audience, which Ms. C represented in her speech as “tu”[you] (e.g., Cuando tú te mueves que hace tu sombra? [When you move, what does your shadow do?]). In contrast to the material processes used in ES, SS, and ENNI read alouds, most of the material processes in the SNNI read aloud were intransitive, meaning that the verb only describes the actions of the “actor” and does not involve another participant or direct object (e.g., Se mueve tambien [It moves as well]; Hace lo mismo [It does the same]). This meant that Ms. C was interested in discussing solely the action of the “actor” rather than to whom the action was directed, as was most common in the ES, SS, and ENNI genres. Given that the topic of the book was focused upon ways in which to manipulate shadows, Ms. C’s use of material processes was functional in communicating this message.

Similar to the findings of mental processes in the ES and SS read alouds, the proportion of mental processes in Ms. C’s speech was higher than the amount of mental processes in the SNNI book. Ms. C used mental processes primarily to encourage
students to engage as “perceivers” with the text such that they were encouraged or asked to look at specific aspects or listen to certain information (e.g., Como se ve tu sombra? [How do you see your shadow?]; Óyeme…y todo el tiempo, podemos ver nuestra sombra? [Listen to me…and can we see our shadow all the time?]). This fit the context of a read aloud with a nonnarrative informational book since Ms. C was continuously referenced and prompted reference to the illustration to support her instruction and discussion of the concepts from the book.

While there were no behavioral processes used in the SNNI text, Ms. C was found to use a few behavioral clauses to encourage students to look at the illustrations (e.g., Mira, estaba pensando que su sombra era una tortuga porque estaba muy quieta [Look, he was thinking that his shadow was a turtle because it was very still]). Thus Ms. C’s use of behavioral processes served a similar purpose as in the SS read aloud, but, unlike the SS read aloud, was found to be functional in navigating the SNNI text for children since Ms. C did not integrate behavioral processes that were at odds with or which misrepresented the meaning of the SNNI book.

Verbal processes were not frequently used in the SNNI text except to quote a few instances of direct speech from characters (e.g., “Que hará mi reflejo si me muevo?” pregunta Tomi [“What will my reflection do if I move?” asked Tomi]). In her extratextual talk, Ms. C was found to use only one instance of a verbal process, which, similar to the SS read aloud, was used to narrate the interactions that were taking place in the story (e.g., Le dice {She told her}).
Existential processes, which posit that an entity or experience exists through the use of the “there is/are” construction, were not used in the book or by Ms. C in the ES genre.

There were no relational processes used in the SNNI text. This indicated that the author did not find it necessary to identify the attributes, values, and possessions in relation to the topic of Tomi’s shadow. In contrast, Ms. C was found to use relational processes mostly for identification purposes, such as to define vocabulary word (e.g., Bostezar significa cuando uno tiene sueno [To yawn means when one is tired]; Un flamenco son [sic] esas pajaros rosados que tienen patas largas [A flamingo are those pink parrots that have large feet]), to make associations between Tomi’s shadow and different animals (e.g. Mira, estaba pensando que su sombra era una tortuga porque estaba muy quieta [Look, he was thinking that his shadow was a turtle because it was very still]; Y el esta pensando que su sombra es un cangrejo [And he was thinking that his shadow is a crab]), and to talk about book parts or vocabulary of the book (e.g., Este libro se llama “Cuando Tomi Se Mueve” [This book is called “When Tomi moves”; Si ese es el nombre del escritor [Yes this is the name of the author]; Y ese fue el final [And this was the end]). Ms. C did not use relational processes to describe attributes or features related to the topic of shadows and movement or to describe possession on the part of the character, the audience, or any objects in the text. These findings suggest that, although relational processes were not salient in the SNNI text, Ms. C used these processes to navigate the text for children.
Theme

The theme is defined as the sentence constituent that serves as the place of departure for a message, or the starting point from which the message will originate. The theme usually contains familiar information that has, at minimum, been mentioned before at some point in the text or discussion. Instead, the rheme is the remainder of the clause that is attached to the theme and which carries the rest of the message. The rheme often contains unfamiliar or new information.

**English storybook read aloud.** When analyzing the pattern of themes in the ES book and Ms. C’s extratextual talk, several similarities were found in thematic progression. The book, which was repetitive in nature, presented different characters as attempting to help soothe the crying baby. Ms. C picked up and expanded upon this information before and after each section of the book where a different character attempted to calm the baby. The following excerpt from the text provides an example of the thematic progression that was typical in the book and in Ms. C’s extratextual talk around the text excerpt.

1. Ms. C: So let’s see what happens next. Who’s the one that’s helping the baby after the mom?
2. Ryan: His brother.
3. Ms. C: Was the brother after the mom?
5. Ms. C: Who do you think it was?
6. Ernesto: The dad!
Ms. C: The dad. {She begins reading from the text} “Her father(a) tried(b). He(c) rocked her gently in his arms and whispered softly in her ear[s](d). But that(e) didn’t help(f). Louise(g) kept on crying until her wails shook [her] the pictures off the walls(h).” {She pauses from reading the text} So the pictures were falling off the wall(i). So she was crying too much(j).

Gabriel: He, he missed--

Ms. C: And what was he doing-What was the father doing, he was what?

Raquel: He was, um,

Ms. C: Whis..(whispering)

Raquel: Whispering.

Ms. C: What does that whispering mean, that we said yesterday?

Raquel: It means talk super super super X (children shout out) and super super super bajito.

Ms. C: Super super super soft(a). You’re right um…Raquel. That’s(b) what whispering(c) and when(d) did we say is a good moment for whispering when we were talking about our amazing words.

Raquel: Um, um, um, whispering -

Ms. C: Which was a good time of the day to talk between each other whispering?

In order to create the context within which to discuss Ms. C’s extratextual talk, I will first discuss the thematic progression that exists in the text read by Ms. C. The
thematic progression follows a zig-zag pattern whereby an element that is introduced in the rheme of clause 1 gets promoted to the theme of clause 2. In the text excerpt, the author first introduces the focal character of the moment, the father, in the story (line 7a) and states in the rheme that he is trying to soothe the baby (line 7b). The father continues as the theme of the next sentence (line 7c), and the rheme expands upon the previous rheme (line 7b) by adding new information and describing the ways that the father attempted to soothe the baby (line 7d). In the third sentence, the previous rheme (line 7d) becomes the theme of the sentence, namely the father’s attempts to calm the child, referred to as “that” (line 7e), with the rheme serving to describe the success of these attempts (line 7f). In the next line, a new theme, namely Louise, the crying baby, is introduced at this point, having been promoted from the participant of a prior rheme (line 7d). The rheme serves to present new information about the consequences of the baby crying. Thus, the text presents a very clear zig-zag progression whereby information in the rheme is fronted and expanded upon with each new line. This was a typical pattern in the ES book.

The thematic progression in Ms. C’s extratextual talk also followed a zig-zag pattern but the topics that she expanded upon were not necessarily represented explicitly in the text or centered around the characters and their actions as was the case in the text. Ms. C frequently announced her segway back to reading, representing the class as whole in the theme of her statement (line 1). To prepare students for the next excerpt of text, she asked a recall question with the theme “who” and used the rheme to communicate to children that this person will also try to calm the baby in the upcoming excerpt of text (line 1). After reading the text, Ms. C summarizes the information from the last sentence.
in the excerpt that she had read (lines 7g & 7h). The theme of her first sentence represented the rheme, “pictures” of the last sentence of the excerpt (line 7i) whereas the theme of her second sentence represented the theme of the last sentence of the excerpt, fronting “she” as a placeholder for Louise. Ms. C then reverts back to talking about the father (line 9), picking up on the themes of the first few initial sentences from the book excerpt (lines 7a & 7c) and using the rheme to ask children to recall his actions. Once Ms. C and children have established that the father was whispering, Ms. C follows the zig-zag thematic progression when she expands on “whispering” by asking a question about its meaning (line 13). She reinforces the child’s response by using the rheme of the child’s answer “super super super bajito” [very very very quiet] (line 14) as the theme of her next two sentences (line 15a & 15b). She expands again on “whispering” by asking a question related to when whispering is appropriate (line 15d & 17).

Thus, the zig-zag progression is evident in Ms. C’s extratextual talk since she picks up on and develops several themes and rhemes from the text and rhemes from her own statements and questions in subsequent speech. Whereas the topics discussed in the book are linear in nature, never departing from a description of the character’s actions towards the baby, Ms. C summarizes this information but also expands on the character’s action by talking about its meaning and prompting children to make a book-to-life connection. As such, Ms. C may be mimicking the thematic progression of the text in the ES genre, but expands upon these topics in ways outside of just having children understand the story events.

Spanish storybook read alouds. The thematic progression of the topics in the SS book also followed somewhat of a zig-zag pattern but not as cleanly as that of the ES
text. This is probably due to the fact that the ES book was repetitive in nature, and thus the same pattern of themes were copied purposefully in each section. Instead, the thematic progression in the SS book was not as clean-cut, with some themes being repeated, some newly introduced and some rhemes being promoted to theme position. The text excerpt below provides an example from which to base an explanation of the differences in thematic progression between the ES and SS texts. The theme of the first line from the book showcases the theme of the sentence (a) which is carried through to the next 3 sentences, namely “Unos” [Some] (b), “Otros” [Others] (c), “Otros” (d), and “Que vegetales” [What vegetables] (e), in which the different vegetables are described. At this point, the author changes theme completely by introducing a new theme “I”, implicit in the conjugated verb “salía” [go out] (1), and then representing the rheme of that sentence (2) as the theme of the next sentence where the neighbors are described as showing the narrator the flowers in their gardens.

“Después de un tiempo, nuestros vegetales(a) crecieron. Unos(b) eran grandes y abultados. Otros(c) eran alargados, verdes y llenos de chichones. Otros(d) eran de un amarillo horrible. Que vegetales(e) tan feos. A veces, salía(1) admirar a otros jardines de los vecinos(2). Ellos(3) me mostraban las amapolas, las peonías, las petunias y yo me entristecía mucho desde que mi jardín no fuera hermoso.”

[After some time, our vegetables(a) grew. Some(b) were big and bulky. Others(c) were long, green, and full of bumps. Others(d) were a horrible yellow. What ugly vegetables(e). At times, I would go out(1) and admire the neighbors’ gardens(2).]
They showed me the poppies, the peonies, the petunias and I became very sad since my garden was not beautiful]

The ways in which Ms. C navigated the text varied throughout the reading such that at times she was found to follow a zig-zag pattern, while in other instances she represented the same theme in her speech over a course of several interactions. The following excerpt showcases the typical thematic progression represented in a teacher’s attempts at navigating the text for children.

1 Ms. C: Entonces, {she begins reading from the book} “Mi mama saludó a la señora Crumerine Gourmerie(a). “Hola, Irma.” “Ella(b) también removía la tierra pero con una palita(c) que le cabía en la mano.” {she pauses from reading the book} [So, my mother greeted Mrs. Crumerine Gourmerie(a). “Hello Irma.” She(b) also removed the soil but with a small shovel(c) that fit in her hand]

2 Ms. C: Era(a) muy pequeña. [It was very small]

3 Ms. C: {She begins reading from the book} “¿Mami, porque nosotros usamos unas palas tan grandes y la señora Crumerine Gourmerie(a) [tiene] una tan chiquita [it]a —le pregunté.” {she pauses from reading the book} [Mother, why do we use a shovel so big and Mrs. Crumerine uses one that is so small – I asked her]

4 Ms. C: Tiene(a) una pala más pequeña. {she begins reading from the book} “Porque- [She has a smaller shovel. Why-]
Yolanda: XXX

Ms. C: ¿Ah? Ella(a) le preguntó a su mamá eso. ¿Porque creen(b) que ella(c) va utilizar una pala grande? ¿Y la señora Gourmerie(d) usa una pala más pequeña? ¿Quién(e) me puede decir algo? ¿Ah? ¿Porque creen(f)? [Huh? She(a) asked her mother this. Why do you think(b) that she(c) is going to use a big shovel? And Mrs. Gourmerie(d) uses a smaller shovel? Who(e) can tell me something? Huh? Why do you think(f)?] Kyle, why do you(g) think she(h) uses a big shovel, and she(i) used a little one? {She points to the illustration} Why do you(j) think that?

Kyle: He used a big shovel-

Ms. C: ¿Porque? Why?

Kyle: He wants to use a big shovel. He wants to use a LITTLE- {Points in the book’s direction.}

Ms. C: AH, PORQUE ellos quieren. ¿Quién(a) tiene otra idea? ¿Porque creen(b) que una persona va usar una pala grande y los otros una pala pequeña? ¿Ah? [Oh, because they want to. Who(a) has another idea? Why do you think(b) that a person will use a big shovel and the others a small shovel? Huh?]

In the first sentence of the excerpt that Ms. C reads, the rheme (line 1a) is picked up as the theme in the second sentence (line 1b). In a similar manner, Ms. C promotes the rheme of the second sentence from the excerpt of the book (line 1c) to the theme of her clarifying statement after she pauses from reading the text (line 2a). She does this again.
with the rheme of the book excerpt that she goes on to read (line 3) and represents “señora Crumerine Gourmerie” as the theme of her second, subsequent clarification statement (line 4a). Thus, in these sequences of Ms. C reading the text, we see the zig-zag thematic progression in the text itself, and also in the way that Ms. C navigates and explains the text for students.

After a child interrupts, Ms. C introduces a new theme to explain the ambiguity related to the fact that the main character, the daughter, is narrating the text (line 6a). Ms. C goes on to ask a question concerned with this main character (line 6c) and “señora Gourmerie” (line 6d) but structures her question in a way that identifies the children in the audience as the theme of the sentence (line 6b). This pattern continues as Ms. C attempts to encourage students to answer her reasoning-based question (lines 6e – 6i), such that the theme of her questions is always the children in the audience, but the rheme of her questions concerns the focal characters that were previously discussed in the text. As such, at times, Ms. C followed the zig-zag pattern in the theme progression, while other times she repeated the same theme, especially if her purpose was to repeat and scaffold a cognitively challenging reasoning question for students.

**English nonnarrative informational read aloud.** The themes in the ENNI book revolved around characters who exemplify different attributes of teeth, characters who talk in first person, references to the reader, the subject of teeth itself, or were commands related to the preservation of teeth. Since this is a nonnarrative informational book, information in the book was organized by topic, and thus the thematic progression in the ENNI book was the multiple-theme pattern. This meant that the theme of one clause,
usually at the beginning of a section, introduced a category of information and
subsequent sentences discussed and/or exemplified different aspects of that category.

Instead, Ms. C tended to construct the themes in her discussion of the text in a
zig-zag pattern, even though the same was not true of the book. For the most part, the
themes used by Ms. C when discussing the text were different to those in the book for
several reasons. Some reasons were because Ms. C talked about the character in third
person while the character was quoted as speaking in first person in the book, Ms. C
integrated book-to-life connections for children, and focused on objects and characters in
pictures that were not explicitly discussed in the text. The following example
demonstrates how themes in the book and themes in Ms. C’s speech functioned
differently.

1  Ms. C: {she begins reading} “Who\(^{(a)}\) has teeth? Well…look\(^{(b)}\) around and
you’ll find out who\(^{(c)}\). You’ll\(^{(d)}\) find that red-bearded [headed] uncles do.” {she
pauses from reading} This\(^{(e)}\) is red-headed uncle. He\(^{(f)}\) has two.

2  Ms. C: And {she begins reading} “Policemen\(^{(a)}\) do. And zebras\(^{(b)}\) too.”
{she pauses from reading} Look\(^{(c)}\) at the teeth of the Zebra. Those\(^{(d)}\) are big
ones. Big teeth.

3  Ms. C: {she begins reading} “And unicycle [sic] riders do.” {she pauses
from reading} Look at the unicycle [sic] riders. What does it mean an
unicycle [sic]? It has only one..?

4  Child: Tire.
Ms. C: One wheel. It has only one. Unicycle actually. I’m sorry I read--misread that word.

Ms. C: {she begins reading} “And camels and their drivers do!” {she pauses from reading} Look at the camels and the drivers.

Ms. C: {she begins reading} “Even little girls named Ruthie all have teeth. All Ruths are toothy.”

The excerpt of the book starts at the beginning of topic-based section of the text that asks “Who has teeth?” and used the question word “who” as the theme (line 1a). The theme of the next sentence starts with the command “look around…” (line 1b), in response to the initial question and the rhyme of the sentence prompts the reader to expect that they will be introduced to several examples of people or animals that have teeth (line 1c). In the next sentence, the rhyme of the previous sentence becomes the theme of the current sentence, “You’ll find that…” and includes new information introducing one example of a person that has teeth (line 1d). As Ms. C continues reading the book in lines 2, 6, and 7, we see that the theme of each sentence is an example of people or animals that have teeth. Thus, the multiple-theme pattern is realized by parallel themes in sentences that are subsumed under the initial, more general sentence which introduces and identifies a particular subject area.

Ms. C navigates the text primarily by pointing out characters in the illustrations, describing their attributes and asking about the meaning of words. Although the themes in the first three sentences from the book could have been used in the same way by Ms. C, she used different themes to point out a character of the page (line 1e) and to describe
how many teeth he has (line 1f). Ms. C does however, following the zig-zag pattern, promote the rheme “red-headed uncle” to theme position in her second sentence. This didn’t match the theme patterns found in the book, since these constituents were written to follow a multiple-theme progression. A similar occurrence took place after Ms. C paused a second time from reading the text (line 2), having read sentences where the themes were examples of people and animals that have teeth. Instead, Ms. C calls students’ attention to the teeth of a character with the theme “Look” (line 2c) and then describes the teeth using the theme “Those” (line d). Although, ultimately, Ms. C drew attention to the focal animals and described his teeth, this was different than the way in which this information was presented or discussed in the book through the themes. Similar patterns are seen in lines 3 & 6, indicating that Ms. C structured her sentences in different ways to the text when navigating these sections for children.

**Spanish nonnarrative informational read aloud.** The SNNI book shares similarities with the ES book in that both are repetitive in nature, and thus, have a clearly defined thematic progression. Unlike the ENNI book’s multiple-theme progression, the SNNI book follows the zig-zag pattern of theme progression whereby the rheme in one clause is promoted to the theme in a subsequent clause. The excerpt from the transcript showcases this pattern. This example shows how the rheme of the first sentence (a) becomes the theme of the second sentence (b), and how the rheme of the third sentence (c) becomes the theme of the fourth sentence (d). These four lines represented text that was repeated on every other page in response to the different shapes of animals that the main character, Tomi, was making.
“Un día soleado, Tomi se ve su sombra\(^a\). Esta\(^b\) tan quieta como una tortuga que toma el sol. Que hará mi sombra si me muevo\(^c\)? - pregunta Tomi. Hazlo\(^d\) y ya verás, dice su mama.” [One sunny day, Tomi saw his shadow\(^a\). It is\(^b\) very still like a turtle that is sunbathing. “What will my shadow do if I move\(^c\)?” asks Tomi. “Do it\(^d\) and you will see,” says his mother]

Ms. C often prompted students to reference the illustrations but also was found to summarize and describe the information in the text as well as to try and prompt students to make book-to-life connections to the material. In the case where Ms. C instructed students to look at the pictures and to make book-to-life experiences, the themes that Ms. C used and those of the book were different, although focusing on the same subject matter. However, when Ms. C was found to summarize and describe the information, there were found to be connections to the themes used in the book, and thus Ms. C’s instruction was a more direct expansion of the information in the text. The following excerpt showcases Ms. C summarizing the text and expanding on the themes and rhemes provided in the book.

1 Ms. C: {She begins reading} “Tomi\(^a\) nada como una foca\(^b\) en el agua. Muy fría como una foca\(^c\), su sombra nada también\(^d\).” {she pauses from reading} Todo lo que Tomi\(^e\) hace, su sombra también, lo…? [Tomi\(^a\) swims like a seal\(^b\) in the water. Very cool like a seal\(^c\), his shadow swims as well\(^d\)] Everything that Tomi\(^e\) does, his shadow also?

2 Students: {in unison} Lo hace. [Does]
Ms. C: Lo hace. Y Tomi\(^{(a)}\) se imagina que su sombra son diferentes…\(^{(b)}\)

{voice goes up, as if leading a question} [Does. And Tomi\(^{(a)}\) imagines that his shadow are different…\(^{(b)}\)]

Student: Animales. [Animals]

Ms. C: Diferentes animales\(^{(a)}\). [Different animals\(^{(a)}\)]

Ms. C reflects several of the themes and rhemes of the text in her summary of what she has read when she pauses from reading. Following true zig-zag formation, Ms. C starts her first summary statement with a theme that references all of Tomi’s actions, “Todo lo que Tomi hace” [Everything that Tomi does] (line 1e), promoting the rheme of the first sentence from the book excerpt into theme position (line 1a). In her next statement about the book (line 3), Ms. C represents the theme of the first sentence from the book excerpt (line 1a) as the theme of her sentence as well (line 3a). The rheme of Ms. C’s statement, “se imagina que su sombra son diferentes…” [he imagines that his shadow are different…] (line 3b) makes reference back to the rheme of the first sentence from the book excerpt (line 1b), while also working to generalize and classify the information by identifying “foca” [seal] as part of the bigger group “diferentes animales” [different animals] (line 3b & 5a). Thus, when summarizing the book, Ms. C is shown to use similar themes and follow a zig-zag thematic progression pattern from the book in order to expand upon the information.
Taxis

Taxis is one way in which to capture and analyze the logical and semantic links between clauses in text and in discourse. Clauses are combined in several different ways and the relationship between two clauses is revelatory of how information is being linked and how cohesion and coherence is being formed in the text or discourse. Coherence refers to how clauses and sentences relate to each other whereas cohesion denotes the internal organization of a message. Conjunctions allow for writers and speakers to express logical relationships between clauses in three main ways: through elaboration, whereby a secondary clause restates and clarifies information in the primary clause; through extension, in which a secondary clause adds, negates, or changes the meanings made in the primary clause; and through enhancement, where the secondary clause extends the primary clause through dimensions of time, comparison, cause, condition, or concession (Eggins, 1994; Eggins & Slade, 1997).

English storybook read aloud. Ms. C used a range of conjunctions (e.g., and, but, so, or, then, if, because) to express a range of logical relations in her discourse. Although these conjunctions were simple in nature, Ms. C was able to communicate complex messages with them. Her use of conjunctions increased in the read aloud when she was explaining the meaning of words, summarizing information from the book, and segwaying to the text (e.g., So let’s see; Then who came along). In particular, her use of conjunctions facilitated her efforts to explain the abstract noun “advice”. The following excerpt showcases how she used logical relations to support her explanation of the meaning of “advice”. Ms. C had just read an excerpt of the book that contained the vocabulary word “advice”. She paused from the text and asked students to try and explain
or define the word. After several attempts from the children, Ms. C responds with her explanation.

1 Raquel: When, XXX you have to clean up and it’s messy, they have to clean up and that’s something to do.

2 Ms. C: Well an advice is not really telling you what to do in that way. It tells you what to do\textsuperscript{(a)}, like a tip\textsuperscript{(b)}. Like I think you should clean the table with soap, because\textsuperscript{(c)} when you use soap it helps you to remove all the dirt on the table. And\textsuperscript{(d)} then\textsuperscript{(e)} I say Oh, I’m going to try that but\textsuperscript{(f)} it’s not telling me go and\textsuperscript{(g)} clean the table with soap! It’s not like that, it’s an advice\textsuperscript{(h)}.

In the second sentence of Ms. C’s explanation, Ms. C provides her initial definition of the word “advice”, using an implicit conjunctive relation to connect the meaning of the first phrase “It tells you what to do” (line 2a) to the second phrase “like a tip” (line 2b). Even though she doesn’t use an actual conjunction, by pairing these two phrases together, she alludes to the connection between them as one of elaboration since she clarifies what she means in the first phrase through the second phrase. Her third sentence is also an implicitly-linked elaboration of her initial definition “It tells you what to do”, where she mimics an interaction that showcases one person giving advice to another.

Her use of “because”\textsuperscript{(2c)}, which aids in justifying the reason why the person should follow the “advice”, helps her to communicate to children that a “tip” or “advice” is usually helpful or positive in nature. The use of this particular conjunction was
strategic given that it helped to link the secondary clause “when you use soap…” in a causal way, setting up the notion that “cleaning the table with soap” will result in the positive result of “removing dirt from the table”. Ms. C used the positive extension “and” (line 2d) and the temporal enhancement conjunction “then” (line 2e) to link the ideas in the third and fourth sentences. While “and” forges the additive link between the third and fourth sentence, the use of “then” helps to signal to children a temporal progression in the action of the dramatized interaction. Ms. C goes on to use the negative extension-based conjunction “but” to contrast an appropriate response to advice (i.e., “I’m going to try that”) with an inappropriate reaction to being given advice (i.e., “go and clean the table with soup”) (line 2f). As a final reiteration of her explanation, Ms. C concludes with two phrases that are also implicitly negatively contrasted, to make the point that “advice” is not a sort of command (line 2h).

Instead, the text of the English storybook contained less of a variety of conjunctions since the story was written to be intentionally repetitive and to repeat the same language structures. The following excerpt reveals the limited number of conjunctions integrated into the text and also showcases how Ms. C used conjunctions to form logical relations between the information in the book and her discussion of it, which in this excerpt, was to summarize information that she had just read.

1 Ms. C: {She begins reading} “Her mother tried. She held her close and^{(a)} sang a little [lula-] lullaby. But^{(b)} that didn’t help. Louis kept on crying until her tears ran like rivers to the sea.” {she pauses from reading and gasps}
Ms. C: So\(^{(a)}\) she was crying so much that\(^{(b)}\) it looked like a what?

Since the excerpt of the text above was repeated every time another character attempted to soothe the crying baby, conjunctions like “and” and “but” were common throughout the text and served to connect the character’s actions, as in the case of “and” (line 1a), and to reveal an undesirable outcome of those actions, as in the case of “but” (line 1b). When Ms. C pauses from reading the text, she used the causal conjunction “so” to indicate that her message is going to review the information that she has just read (line 2a). Moreover, she used the elaborative conjunction “that” to restate and emphasize, through the metaphor in the secondary clause, the degree to which the child was crying (line 2b).

Thus, the analysis of taxis in Ms. C’s discourse shows that what determined her usage of conjunctions and the complexity of those logical relations was not use of the conjunctions in the book but more the purpose of her instruction and the degree of abstractness in the message that she was communicating, as seen in her explanation of the abstract noun. Through the logical relations, created through the use of conjunctions, she models to children the ways in which coherence and cohesion is created in the text and in her discussion about the text.

**Spanish storybook read aloud.** In contrast to the English storybook, the Spanish storybook contained a variety of conjunctions throughout the book. While most of the conjunctions were simple in nature such, as the frequent use of “and”, there were also numerous causal, comparative, and contrastive conjunctions that functioned to express more complex logical relationships. Overall, there was more of a variety of conjunctions
in the Spanish storybook than the English storybook in part because the Spanish
storybook did not contain repetitive language and thus was more likely to feature more
diverse language structures.

There was also found to be a difference in the way that Ms. C used conjunctions
in the two read alouds. While Ms. C used conjunctions independent of whether they were
being used in the English storybook, in the SS read aloud, Ms. C generally incorporated
complex sentences in her speech when she was discussing sections of the book that also
used conjunctions. The following excerpt showcases this trend.

1  Mr. C: Entonces, {She begins reading} “Mi mama saludó a la señora

Crumerine Gourmerie. “Hola, Irma.” Ella también levantaba la tierra pero (a)
con una palita que le cabía en la mano.” [So, my mother greeted
Mrs. Crumerine Gourmerie. “Hello Irma.” She also removed the soil
but with a small shovel that fit in her hand] {she pauses from reading}
Era muy pequeña. [It was very small]

2  Ms. C: {She begins reading} “¿Mami, porque nosotros usamos unas palas
tan grandes y (a) la señora Crumerine Gourmerie [tiene] una tan
chiquitita (b) — le pregunté?” [Mother, why do we use a shovel so big
and (a) Mrs. Crumerine Gourmerie uses one that is so small (b) – I asked
her?] {she pauses from reading} Tiene una pala mas pequeña. (c) {Brings
fingers together to show the small size of shovel.} “Porque- [She has a
smaller shovel. Why-]

3  Yolanda: XXX
Ms. C: ¿Ah? Ella le preguntó a su mamá eso. ¿Porque creen que ella va
textilizar una pala grande? {Points toward illustration.} ¿Porque la señora
Gourmerie usa una pala más pequeña? ¿Quién me puede decir algo? ¿Ah?
¿Porque creen? [Huh? She asked her mother this. Why do you think
that she is going to use a big shovel? And Mrs. Gourmerie uses a smaller
shovel? Who can tell me something? Huh? Why do you think?] {to Kyle}
Kyle, why do you think she uses a big shovel, and she used a little one?
{Points at illustration.} Why do you think that?

Kyle: He used a big shovel-

Ms. C: ¿Porque? Why?

Kyle: He wants to use a big shovel. He wants to use a LITTLE-
{Points in the book’s direction.}

Ms. C: AH, PORQUE ellos quieren. ¿Quién tiene otra idea? ¿Porque
creen que una persona va usar una pala grande y los otros una pala
pequeña? ¿Ah? [Oh, because they want to. Who has another idea? Why
do you think that a person will use a big shovel and the others a small
shovel? Huh?]

Yolanda: Porque sí.[Because yes]

Ms. C: Porque... Vamos a ver que responden acá. “Porque nuestra
vuelta necesita que la removamos más, me contestó.” La mamá
respondió porque su vuelta necesita una pala grande {Gesturing
shoveling motion.} para revolverla más. {Flips to next page.}

[Because yes...let’s see what they say here. “Because our crop
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requires that we turn it more, she replied to me.” The mother responded because her crop needed a big shovel to turn it more.]

The first text excerpt that Ms. C reads contains the conjunction “but” (line 1a), a negative extension conjunction, which is an important feature used to highlight the fact that the characters are using different gardening tools. When Ms. C goes on to read the next excerpt of text, she neglects to read the conjunction “y” [and] (line 2a), making the conjunctive relation between these two phrases implicit (line 2b). After a child interrupts Ms. C (line 3), she summarizes the information that she has just read and asks children to reason about why this difference in tools exists across these characters, using the conjunction “y” [and] to connect the two independent phrases in an additive manner (line 4a). She restates this question in English for Kyle who is an English-dominant child and who Ms. C may perceive as needing more support to understand her question. When she translates her question, she maintains the use of “and” as a way in which to create a logical relationship whereby she is adding meaning onto the primary clause “she uses a big shovel” (line 4b). The child responds by describing a characteristic that both characters share, rather than specifying a difference that explains why they use tools of different sizes (line 7a & 7b).

Ms. C reinforces this answer by restating it and translates the child’s response into Spanish as a way to model the response in the target language. In restating the response, she adds the conjunction “porque” [because] to reinforce the causal relationship between Ms. C’s initial question and the child’s response (line 8a). Although the child’s response is not necessarily incorrect, he has provided a similar characteristic between the two
characters rather than a response that talks about that highlights their differences. Since Ms. C represented the relationship between the two ideas in her questions in an additive way, through the use of “y” or “and” rather than “but” (line 4a, 4b), the child may have misunderstood Ms. C’s request for a justification of differences as a request for similar characteristics.

Thus, this excerpt shows how Ms. C used conjunctions to forge logical relationships in her speech and in her questions in sections of the text where conjunctions were also used to present conjunctive relationships. This excerpt also demonstrates how the strategic use of conjunctions is important in order to appropriately guide children in comprehending the purpose of a question. Lastly, the findings showed that at times, Ms. C did not read the book word-for-word, which resulted in the omission of important structures such as conjunctions that helped to convey cohesion and cohesiveness of the text.

**English nonnarrative informational book read aloud.** Conjunctions that were used in the ENNI text were mostly simple in nature (i.e., and, or, but), with the frequency of conjunction usage increasing in sections of the text where the process of growing and losing teeth was being described and discussed. Similar to the findings in the ES read aloud, Ms. C was found to use more conjunctions in her extratextual talk than what was available in the book, regardless of the frequency of conjunction use in the text. Moreover, Ms. C included a variety of conjunctions, some of which were more complex than those used in the text. Conjunctions were especially salient in her speech when she was making book-to-life connections for children, segwaying to reading, and suggesting that they check the facts with the dentist. The following excerpt showcases the use of
In the first few sentences of the book, the process of losing and growing teeth is discussed. The logical connectors “and” (line 1a) and “when” (line 1b), found at the beginning of the second sentence of text, help to coordinate the discussion around the first step in the process of losing teeth. The conjunction “and” is a positive extension that helps to link the idea of the first sentence, “You will lose set number one” to a description
in the secondary clause of the second sentence “It’s not much fun”. The “when” (line 1d) functions as a temporal enhancer that signals to students the moment in which the processes represented in these two sentences will co-occur. The text goes on to discuss when the teeth-growing process takes place, juxtaposing it with the teeth-losing process through the use of “but” (line 1c) and indicating the order in which these processes take place through the use of “then” (line 1d). In the next few lines, the positive extension “and” is used to link a description of the quality of teeth, “and all brand new” (line 3a) as well as the number of teeth, “16 downstairs and 16 more upstairs” (line 3b) that children will get in the teeth-growing process. The author signals the end of the teeth-growing process in the next line by using the conjunctions “and” (line 3c) and “when” (line 3d) to describe the arrival of the second set of teeth and equate this temporally to the fact that “that’s all the teeth you’ll ever get”. Thus, these conjunctions enable the author to define the sequential events related to growing and losing teeth.

Ms. C helps to support this message by commenting on the process (line 2) and summarizing and reviewing the process that has just been described in the book (line 4). Ms. C highlights the fact that the new set of teeth are the final set of teeth that children will receive by using the negative extension “but” (line 4a) to juxtapose her first statement “he’s going to get a new one after that” with her reference to the last sentence she read from the text, “that’s all the teeth you’ll ever get” (end of line 3). To introduce the potential situation of losing teeth and to talk about the consequences, she used a conditional conjunction “if” (line 4c) and connects it to her previous statement where she expresses hope against this possibility. As such, Ms. C is able to discuss and describe all
three processes around teeth (losing, growing, and maintaining) through her strategic use of conjunctions and her extratextual discussion of the information in the book.

**Spanish nonnarrative informational book read aloud.** The SNNI text, “Cuando Tomi se mueve”, contained a number of conjunctions, some of which were simple (e.g. y [and]), meaning that they joined phrases in an additive manner, and others which were more complex (e.g., si [if], como [how/like], cuando [when]), meaning that they depicted more elaborate relationships between phrases. These more complex conjunctions were used in the text to facilitate discussion and description of Tomi’s shadow movements. The text did not comprise of a large variety of conjunctions given that the text was written to be repetitive, similar to that of the English storybook. As such, the same conjunctions were used multiple times in the same manner to describe the movement and characteristics of Tomi’s different animal-shaped shadows.

While there were fewer conjunctions in Ms. C’s extratextual talk than in the book, the conjunctions that she used generally mirrored those applied in the text. Ms. C was found to incorporate other complex conjunctions, not used in the text (e.g., para [to], para que [for]), during one instance of the read aloud where she integrated topic-related information beyond that which had been provided in the SNNI book. For the most part, however, Ms. C did not discuss the information in the text in a different or more thorough way and thus, did not incorporate a high number of conjunctions or a more varied range of logical connectors. The following excerpt showcases the way in which Ms. C used similar conjunctions as the text in her extratextual discussion.
Ms. C: {She begins reading the book} “Cuando Tomi se mueve. Un día soleado, Tomi se ve su sombra. Esta tan quieta como (a) una tortuga que toma el sol. Que hará mi sombra si (b) me muevo?, pregunta Tomi. Hazlo y (c) ya veras, dice su mama.”{Ms. C pauses from reading and shows students the illustration} [When Tomi moves. One sunny day, Tomi sees his shadow. It is still like (a) a turtle that is sunbathing. “What will my shadow do if (b) I move?” asks Tomi. “Do it and (c) you will see,” says his mother]

Ms. C: Mira Tomi, y (a) es es su mama. Mira, estaba pensando que (b) su sombra era una tortuga. [Look at Tomi and (a) this is his mother. Look, he was thinking that (b) his shadow was a turtle that was very still.]

Ms. C: “Tomi se agacha como (a) un cangrejo en una tierra soleado. Como (b) un cangrejo, su sombra se agacha también.” {Ms. C pauses from Reading and points to page} [Tomi crouches like (a) a crab in a sunny spot. Like (b) a crab, his shadow crouches as well.]

Ms. C: Mira como (a) hace como (b) un congrejo asi {she copies the picture} y su sombra -hacelo- [Look how (a) he is acting like (b) a crab like that (c) and his shadow does-]

Ms. C: Mismo [the same]  
Ms. C: Mismo verdad? Y (a) él está pensando que su sombra es un--? [the same, right? And (a) he is thinking that his shadow is a--?]

Daniel: Cangrejo. [Crab]
The beginning of the book introduces Tomi and compares the shape of his shadow to the first of many different animals. Through the use of “como” (line 1a), the stillness of Tomi’s shadow is equated with the stillness of a turtle bathing in the sunlight. In order to add information about the different attributes of shadows, the author goes on to juxtapose Tomi and his shadow through the use of “si” [if] (line 1b) in order to question if the movement of one will affect the movement of the other. In the subsequent line, the mother prompts Tomi to experiment with this notion by commanding him to perform the action, “Hazlo” and then suggesting that he will observe the result, “ya veras” [you will see]. These two parts of the experiment are connected together through the use of the positive extension conjunction “y” [and] (line 2a). Ms. C recaps the text by pointing out Tomi and his mother in the illustration, using the “y” [and] conjunction to link the two (line 2a), and by using the elaborating conjunction “que” [that] to define Tomi’s thoughts about his shadow (line 2b).

In the next excerpt of the book that Ms. C reads, the author used the conjunction “como” [like] to compare Tomi’s movement to the action of a crab (line 3a), and the crab’s action to the movement of Tomi’s shadow (line 3b). In order to reinforce this relationship between Tomi, the focal animal, and Tomi’s shadow, Ms. C used the same conjunction “como” [like] to associate the Tomi’s action with the movement of a crab (line 4b), and used “como” [how] to direct student’s attention in particular to the similarity in these movements. Finally, she used the positive extension conjunction “y” [and] (line 6a) to indicate that, because Tomi is moving like a crab, he thinks his shadow is a crab too.
Thus this excerpt reveals that Ms. C used similar conjunctions as are used in the text to reinforce the concepts that are being introduced and discussed in the book. This excerpt also shows however, that while Ms. C highlighted the relationship between Tomi, his shadow, and an animal, she did not highlight the mother’s prompt for Tomi to conduct his shadow-movement experiment. Since this is a nonnarrative informational book, discussing this experiment and it’s outcome would align well with the purpose of the text. However, the results show that Ms. C focused on more narrative features of the text, such as Tomi’s actions and thoughts more than on the science-related features of the text, such as the experiment and the inquiry-based question that Tomi asks (i.e. “¿Qué hará mi sombra si me muevo? [What will my shadow do if I move?]”).
CHAPTER SIX: SYNTHESIS AND DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

Exposure to shared readings and participation in the book-based conversations are important aspects that support emergent bilingual students’ development of oral language and early literacy skills needed for later academic and literacy success (Sénéchal, LeFevre, Hudson, & Lawson, 1996). In order to be successful learners, students are required to recognize that language is structured and organized differently according to the purposes it serves within different genres and disciplines (Kamberelis, 1999). For emergent bilingual students, this means learning language-specific features of genres in the multiple languages that they are in the process of developing. Teachers can apprentice children (Rogoff, 1990; Vygotsky, 1987) in the different genre-specific registers of academic discourse by modeling the registers of different languages in academic book-based discussions (Alvarez, 2012), encouraging the practice of specific forms through conversational exchanges (Swain, 1997), and being responsive to students’ linguistic needs (Price, Bradley, & Smith, 2012).

In the context of book-based interactions, teachers can support students’ academic discourse development by explicitly teaching important vocabulary and grammatical structures as they emerge in texts (Peercy, 2011), calling students’ attention to how different genres build and present information (Fang, Schleppegrell, & Cox, 2006), exposing students to books with different academic registers, translating and interpreting the academic registers of these texts, and engaging students in cross-genre reading and discussion (Alvarez, 2012). Thus, book-based interactions present ideal opportunities for teachers to focus on academic language-related aspects within and across book genres (Schleppegrell, Achugar, & Oteiza, 2004).
A central goal of this study was to examine the nature of a dual language preschool teacher’s instructional practices and discourse features in Spanish and English read alouds across different genres of books. Specifically, I asked: (1) How are teachers’ instructional and discourse practices functional for interacting across different genres and in different languages? (a) What is the nature of teachers’ instructional practices across different genres and languages? (b) What discourse features are reflected in teachers’ extratextual talk across different genres of text and in different languages? To answer these research questions, I examined the extratextual talk of a Spanish-English bilingual teacher during her read aloud of two genres of books, storybooks and nonnarrative informational books, both in English and in Spanish. First, I examined Ms. C’s instructional strategies and targets across each genre and language and then compared the discourse features underlying Ms. C’s instructional practices across genres and language. Finally, I examined Ms. C’s discourse features and the discourse features of the books she was reading in order to analyze how Ms. C’s extratextual talk was functional in navigating the book for students.

The results of this research help to add to the literature in areas that could not be informed by the findings of studies featuring reading interventions (e.g., Price et al., 2012). Since these studies required that teachers read in a particular manner or within particular participatory structures (e.g., in teacher-child dyads; Torr & Clugston, 1999), the results did not provide information about teachers’ actual practices in natural whole-group, classroom settings. Where other studies used a quantitative approach to report differences, the findings of this study attempted to address the complexities in the nature of the differences rather than comparing rates of different types of utterances (e.g., Price
The findings of the study reveal that Ms. C’s attention to vocabulary, narrative, nonnarrative, and print knowledge targets varied across genres and languages. Similarly instructional strategies were also shown to be used differentially by Ms. C across English and Spanish storybook and informational read alouds. Analysis of Ms. C’s discourse features revealed that there was variation in Ms. C’s role, the organization of the activity, and the content of her extratextual talk across the same book genre in different languages and across different book genres in the same language.

**Teacher’s Discourse Features**

In this chapter, I use two models to discuss the major themes that emerged in relation to the discourse features that were used by Ms. C. Drawing from the systemic functional linguistic theory (Halliday, 1985) and Martin & Rose’s (2007, 2008) stratified theory of text in context model, I designed the first model (below) to capture the ways in which Ms. C’s discourse features varied across language of book/instruction, book genres, and book content. The model demonstrates the findings, which indicate that (a) variations in mood were found to emerge from differences in language of book/instruction and book genre, but not book content, (b) variations in theme were found to be based upon language of book/instruction, book genre, and book content, and (c) variations in process emerged from differences in the book genre and book content, but not language of book/instruction. Thus, book genre, as the central construct in which the other constructs overlap, in terms of discourse features, is the aspect which determined
the organization of Ms. C’s message, the role that she assumes in the read aloud, and the knowledge and content that she navigates for children in her speech.

**DISCOURSE FEATURES**

![Discourse Features Diagram]

Figure 5. 1 Discourse features across language of book/instruction, genre, content

**Interpersonal Metafunction: Mood & Modality**

Interpersonally, Ms. C’s role in each read aloud varied according to the language of the book/instruction and the genre of book she was reading. In the Spanish language read alouds, Ms. C provided more opportunities for students to orally participate in the activity and to recall and discuss the concepts of the book. This finding stands in contrast to a previous study in the same dual language preschool center (Gort, Pontier, & Sembiante, 2012) which shows that teachers asked more open-ended questions in Spanish read alouds than English read alouds, as defined by the mood of the phrases in teacher’s
extratextual talk. In the SS genre, Ms. C took on a role in which she requested a lot of input from children to summarize and interpret the book’s meaning. In the ENNI and SNNI read alouds, she also requested that students help her to recap the text, but she did so in a more controlling fashion, asking closed questions rather than open-ended questions as she had in the SS read aloud. Instead in the English language reading aloud, Ms. C enacted more of an informant and director role since she was found to interact using statements and commands. In both the ES and ENNI genres, Ms. C summarized the text for children, meaning that she did not create a relationship whereby the children were given the power to co-navigate and co-construct the meaning of the text. Much research has documented the tendency for teachers to instruct children during read alouds in a way that minimizes their opportunities for oral participation (John, 2009; Long & Sato, 1983). While teachers may attempt to guide children in the read aloud by dominating and directing the activity, the consequence of assuming such a role is that the teacher is construed as holding the power and knowledge, as was the case with Ms. C, the text is positioned as an external entity to the children, and the information in the text is never accessed by children at a deeper level of understanding because they are not given the opportunity to negotiate, interpret, and engage in discussion around the concepts (John, 2009).

Ms. C also integrated more commands in the information book readings in both English and Spanish to direct students’ attention to specific parts of the book. Commands were one way in which Ms. C scaffolded and controlled the manner in which children engaged with the text since she used this discourse feature to instruct children to reference the book illustrations and make connections to the text in specific ways. Other
research that has analyzed the mood of teacher’s extratextual talk in teacher-centered reading activities have also documented that speech to be made up of mostly commands and statements rather than questions (Long & Sato, 1983). In conjunction with those commands, Ms. C also used modality to suggest, advise, require, or compel students to reference the illustrations, link their experiences to the content of the text, and to behave in ways that would facilitate the act of reading the book. Thus, Ms. C’s role shifted to be more directive and controlling of the ways in which children engaged with the text as she went from reading in Spanish to English, and reading storybooks to reading informational books.

This shift may have originated from several different characteristics of the instructional environment, the first of which was that in general, storybooks were much more frequently read than informational books. This is has been a well-documented trend in many elementary school classrooms (Duke, 2003; Duke, Bennett-Armistead, & Roberts, 2003; Pentimonti et al., 2010; Yopp & Yopp, 2006). This could suggest that Ms. C may have had a predetermined schema in which to read storybooks, since she was more accustomed to reading this genre, and thus, exerted more control over the direction and pace of the during these read alouds. Moreover, because the content of the Spanish informational text was much simpler than the English informational book, Ms. C may have perceived children as finding the English informational book more difficult to read (Donovan & Smolkin, 2001) which may have affected the way in which Ms. C navigated these texts for children. As such, she may have increased the amount of

---

8 This is contrary, however, to the majority of research in the field indicating that children can interact successfully with informational books if provided with the opportunity (Donovan, 1996; Duke, 2003; Oyler & Barry, 1996; Yopp & Yopp, 2000), and that children have shown preferences for informational books over storybooks (Kletzien & Szabo, 1998; Pappas, 1991, 1993).
scaffolding and control that she exerted around children’s engagement with the ENNI text given their complexity of the content.

Another reason to explain Ms. C’s shift in role in Spanish versus English language read alouds is that Ms. C may have been vigilant of the possibility that there were a number of Spanish-dominant emergent bilingual students who needed more support to understand and engage with the content of the English-language book. As such, rather than asking questions that required the children to summarize the book – a task that would be difficult for children who did not yet have productive skills in English - Ms. C took the opportunity to recap the text for children, providing them instead with the opportunity to discuss their own book-to-life connections - a topic that may have been more accessible to and better aligned with the children’s productive English language capabilities. For example, studies have found that children who make relevant connections to what they know and have experienced show more interest in the topic-at-hand and are more likely to actively participate in conversation (Frank, Dixon, & Brandts, 2001; Gambrell & Almasi, 1996; Ganske, Monroe, & Strickland, 2003). Ms. C may have also been more comfortable reading and interacting in Spanish given that it was her native language and the language that she code switched into during English language read alouds when conversing with children about more personal aspects of their lives.

Modality was used by Ms. C to manage children’s behavior, and in the process, to model the act of reading and writing and to prompt them to reference illustrations, specifically through modals of inclination and obligation. The use of modals by teachers has been documented to be an especially effective way in which not only regulate children’s behavior, but to use modality as a tool in which to shape students’
understanding of the methods and manners of functioning within activities as is valued in larger society (Christie, 2002). Thus, through the teacher’s frequent modal usage to prepare and manage students’ behaviors before and during the reading of the book, she signals, models, and apprentices them into the physical and cultural conventions of the act of reading and engaging with books.

When navigating the text, Ms. C also used modals in order to communicate nuanced meanings around the topics of the text. Several patterns were found regarding modals, including the fact that the ES and SNNI books, which were repetitive and simple in nature, did not contain many modals in the text. In these sessions, Ms. C highlighted modals that were found in the text, but also integrated the use of modals in order to explain figurative language in the ES genre, such as with inclination modals, and to make or prompt book-to-life connections for children in the SNNI genre, such as through probability modals. Instead in the SS and ENNI sessions, the books contained a variety of modals, given that the texts were more complex and detailed in nature. Ms. C were found to highlight the modals in the text and to integrate modals independently in order to prompt students to answer probability-based prediction and obligation-based justification questions in the SS genre, and to make book-to-life connections through the use of probability modals in the ENNI read aloud. Thus, the use of modals in the book seemed to influence whether Ms. C would use modals in her discussion of the text regardless of genre or language. Only when teachers went beyond information in the book did they integrate more modals in these genres. Instead, with books that contained more modals, Ms. C used these in her discussion in order to help her discuss the concepts. Thus, the use of modals was in part related to how many modals were used in the text, unless Ms. C
integrated additional information beyond the text that was abstract in nature. As such, the use of modals, and the type of modals used were not different according to the genre, topic, or language of the book/instruction. Instead, it seemed to be a factor that related more to the way in which the text was written by the author, and the ways in which Ms. C wanted to navigate the text. As a way to express attitude, judgment, or appreciation, the mood system offers a way in which teachers can shape learners’ understanding and sense-making of the world (Christie, 2012), and of the meaning and range of appropriate responses to a text in the context of a book-reading. Ms. C’s use of modals helped children to construct a nuanced understanding of the meaning of words but also helped children to begin thinking about the appropriate context in which to use those words (e.g., in the case of the teacher’s explanation of “advice”). Thus Ms. C is not only apprenticing children into the appropriate behaviors in the act of reading, but also the ways in which to engage in a text, and how to use that information outside of the text for real-world purposes.

**Ideational Metafunction: Process & Taxis**

Experientially, the read aloud activity was found to vary based on the genre of the book and the topic of the book, but not on the language in which the read aloud was conducted. This was demonstrated in the analysis and findings related to processes in the focal book as well as in Ms. C’s discussion of the book. In terms of the experiential metafunction, or the analysis of process as the way in which experiences and meaning are encoded into language, several patterns emerged that were indicative of differences in genre and topic of the book as influential upon the ways in which Ms. C navigated the
text. Although three distinct processes were shown to be prevalent across genre and languages (e.g., material, mental, and relational processes) – a finding that is corroborated in previous research (Christie, 2012) - closer analysis of these processes showed that their function in the text and as used by Ms. C when navigating the book for children was qualitatively different in each read aloud. This was expected given the contrasting global elements and structures of storybooks and informational books, and thus their differing purposes and goals.

For example, processes in the storybook and in Ms. C’s speech were used to describe character actions and story events, whereas processes in the informational book and in teacher’s speech were used to depict children’s observations and experiences of the focal topic’s various attributes and characteristics. In storybooks and in Ms. C’s talk of the storybook, she was either describing/asking about character actions (through behavioral and material processes), promoting children’s perceptual or cognitive engagement with the characters or storyline (through mental processes), attributing or identifying qualities of characters and situations (through relational processes), or calling children to attend to dialogue or illustrations related to characters and story events (through verbal and behavioral processes). Since storybooks have been documented to be dominated by the temporal sequences of the story events (Donovan & Smolkin, 2002), and cohesion in storybooks is created by the actions of the characters, expressed through the processes (Stein & Glenn, 1979), the findings regarding the teacher’s focus of processes aligns well with previous research.

Instead, the processes in the informational book functioned much differently since the focal topic of the book was an object or phenomenon with which children had their
own lived experiences (e.g. teeth, shadows and shadow movement). As such, in the informational books and in Ms. C’s discussion of the text, processes were used to describe children’s actions with this topic (i.e., with teeth or with shadows) (through material processes), their perception of the topic (through mental processes), a description of the attributes and characteristic events related to the topic (relational and behavioral processes), and ways in which to verify the factual evidence being provided about the topic (verbal processes). Ms. C may have integrated a large focus on children’s experiences with the object or phenomenon given that in order to make sense of the factual information, children draw on their own knowledge and experiences with the object or phenomenon in their own lives (Karmiloff-Smith, 1979).

Differences in the use and function of processes within the storybook genre and within the informational genre also emerged based on the topic of the book. The ES book was repetitive in nature and used similar language structures and sentences to describe the attempts of different family members to soothe a crying baby. The SS book was not repetitive in nature, and instead, offered a more detailed storyline with numerous characters that focused on technical and cultural differences of growing flowers and vegetables. As such, the differences in topic and complexity of storyline in each book may have been the cause for Ms. C’s differential attention towards character-related features of the narrative in the ES book and story event-based features of the narrative in the SS book. Since the reader was provided with more exposure to each specific family member in the ES book, and the storyline was much more detailed and complex in the SS book, Ms. C’s attempts at navigating the book captured these differences at the experiential level. Thus, Ms. C’s attempts to navigate these storybooks were responsive
to the nuanced differences in the narrative aspects of the book within the storybook genre.

A similar pattern emerged in Ms. C’s attempts at navigating the experiential features of nonnarrative informational books. The ENNI book was written about the location, function, features, and growth-loss cycle of teeth while the SNNI book was written about the shape and movement of shadows in comparison to animals’ shapes and movements. Given these separate topics, differences were found in the ways in which meaning and experience were relayed through processes in each book and in Ms. C’s extratextual talk. For example, teeth were usually featured as the direct object that the material process was acting upon through the actions of children or characters. Instead, the shadow, by virtue of its nature, cannot act upon objects or people and thus was seldom portrayed by material processes as exerting force on a direct object. While for the most part, Ms. C’s use of processes highlighted experiences around the focal topic, there were several instances where she focused upon or infused attention to more narrative-like aspects of the text, such as attention to the character’s identity or their actions in the text.

Differences in the nature of these two topics also equated with differences in the processes used to portray experiences around the topics. Although material processes were used when discussing each, relational processes were predominantly used to discuss attributes of teeth while mental processes were predominantly used to prompt children to perceive attributes of shadows. These findings align with previous research that has documented the most prevalent processes in each book genre. According to Donovan (2001) and based on previous studies (e.g., Kamberelis, 1999; Pappas, 1991), the informational genre is highly dense with relational processes, and typically offers
numerous examples of each type of relational process. This was certainly true in the case of the English nonnarrative informational book, where relational processes were the second most commonly used process. However, previous research also indicated that material and mental processes are found more readily in narrative genres (Pappas, 1991). This was not the case for the Spanish nonnarrative informational book which showed to contain mostly material and mental processes rather than relational processes. Given that Pappas (1991), Donovan (2001), and Kamberelis (1999) examined English books when establishing these genre-based characteristics, their reported distribution of processes by genre may not appropriately represent the characteristics of books in Spanish. This statement, however, is based on the textual analysis of only one Spanish nonnarrative informational book, and since my study was not designed to compare the textual features of different genres of Spanish and English books, the contrasting characteristics that emerged around the SNNI book may not be representative of other SNNI books.

Thus, these findings indicate that, for the most part, Ms. C navigated the text for children in a way that appropriately represented and captured the unique experiences and meanings of the stories and concepts discussed in the books according to their genre and their topic. No difference was found in the way that Ms. C navigated the experiential metafunctions of the books due to differences in the languages of the book or of instruction.

Logically, the lack of conjunctions in the book, the simplicity of conjunctions in the book, or the lack of a variety of conjunctions was not found to influence Ms. C’s use of conjunctions in her extratextual talk in any genre or language. While the variability in the use of logical connectors in the text differentiated the thematic progression and
cohesion of each book, this variability was not shown to limit or effect Ms. C’s use of these features in her own discussion. Thus, Ms. C was found to use logical connectors in read alouds, such as with the ES and SNNI books, where the text was repetitive in nature and included a few simple conjunctions and a limited variety of conjunctions. In these cases, Ms. C integrated the use of conjunctions when she discussed topics that were complex or more abstract. Since these books did not discuss abstract concepts in ways that warranted the use of conjunctions, she often discussed more complex subjects by introducing new topic-related information that expanded on the concepts available in the book. In the SS genre, where there was a variety of complex conjunctions found in the text, Ms. C was found to use conjunctions in sections of the book where there was also an increased use of conjunctions given that more abstract ideas were being discussed. Thus, these findings show that the degree of complexity or abstractness of concepts was what drove teachers to use conjunctions, whether these abstract concepts originated from the text that Ms. C was reading or whether they were introduced by Ms. C to expand on the book content. Moreover, the results also indicated that Ms. C would often integrate more complex information into her reading, in both languages and genres, if it was not available in the book. Thus, books that present information in more complex ways support more complex discussions, however teachers can still integrate complex discussions in simple texts, as long as they make an effort to elaborate on and expand on the concepts in the text.

Previous research showed that teachers were found to highlight the function of logical connectors in developing thematic progression and cohesion (Aguirre-Muñoz et al., 2008; Schleppegrell & de Oliveira, 2006), and constructing different types of
relationships between ideas (Aguirre-Muñoz et al., 2008; Hammond, 2006; Torr & Clugston, 1999). This was not found to be the case in my study. Since this research was conducted with teachers of children who were several years older than those in this study, it was not expected, and may not have been appropriate, for Ms. C to discuss conjunctions in this way with the emergent bilingual preschool children. Instead, she may have tried to highlight the function of conjunction words in other ways in her discussion of the text, such as through talking about their function in the meaning that they helped to create in the book. There were several examples from the data, however, that showed she did not make these logical connectors salient to children in ways that were appropriate for preschool children. For example, Ms. C also attempted to shorten the SS text by cutting out words or sections of the book as she read (e.g., ¿Mami, porque nosotros usamos una s*pala tan grande y la señora Crumerine Gourmerie [tiene] una tan chiquit[a].” [Mommy, why do we use a such a large shovel and Mrs. Crumerine Gourmerie has such a small one]). By paraphrasing, Ms. C eliminated important conjunctions that functioned to create logical relationships between sentences. While children could still understand the story, paraphrasing raised the level of challenge in comprehending the meaning of the text since the relationships between the sentences were now implicit and had to be inferred by children, especially since Ms. C did not explicitly point out the logical relationships. This practice did not aid Ms. C to scaffold and navigate the text for emergent bilingual children who needed explicit instruction of the function of different structural features in order to learn how cohesion and coherence is created in academic texts. Moreover, Ms. C asked a question in which she wanted students to think about the differences between two characters in the book, but used the wrong conjunction and was
not able to communicate her message or intention correctly (e.g., ¿Porque creen que ella va utilizar una pala grande? ¿Y la señora Gourmerie usa una pala más pequeña? [Why do you think that she will use a big shovel? And Mrs. Gourmerie uses a smaller shovel?]).

This incident shows the importance of Ms. C highlighting and modeling the correct conjunction and logical relationships in her questions in order to appropriately navigate the meaning of the text for students. Since Ms. C asked a question that mimicked the language structures used of the same statement in the book, this incident also signals the important for teachers to be critical of the ways in which sentences are phrased in Spanish language children’s books, especially if the book is a translated version of the original English text – as was the case here – and to be critical of modifying statements into questions, as Ms. C did. Thus, this finding differed from the results of previous research and may indicate that, without specific training, teachers may not know the importance of or the way in which to make these features salient to children, as was shown to be the case in other studies (Aguirre-Muñoz et al., 2008; Hammond, 2006; Torr & Clugston, 1999).

Together, the experiential and logical metafunctions make up the ideational metafunction which represents the content and knowledge that Ms. C was trying to navigate for students from the text. In terms of both process and taxis, Ms. C was shown to navigate books differentially according to book genre and book content, but was shown to formulate and reflect logical relationships when talking about abstract concepts regardless of the number of logical relationships that were reflected in the text. Overall, the logical and experiential ways in which she navigated the text did not change based on the language of the book.
Textual Metafunction: Theme

Theme was found to differ based on the genre of the book such that storybooks followed a zig-zag thematic pattern and informational books followed a multiple-theme pattern. In general, Ms. C reflected the thematic pattern of storybooks in her extratextual discussion, but tended to focus on the same theme for multiple lines of interaction in the SS storybook. This may have aided Ms. C to explore that subject more deeply than the ways in which it was presented in the book. Ms. C followed the multiple theme pattern in the SNNI read aloud but did not do so in the ENNI genre, where she discussed the book in more of a zig-zag pattern. This may have resulted from the fact that Ms. C did not often read informational books, and since the ENNI book was more complex in nature, she may have defaulted to discussing the book using a narrative style in order to pick up on each concept that was discussed. Research shows that elementary teachers prefer mixed genre books, where facts are presented within a narrative structure, over informational genres because they found these genres easier to read, given the underlying story, and perceived them to be more interesting to students (Donovan & Smolkin, 2001). This provides one possible explanation as to why Ms. C defaulted to discussing the nonnarrative informational book in a narrative style.

Moreover, based upon the number of read aloud videos that were captured in the focal classroom over a one academic year period, only one third of those read alouds (eight videos) featured nonnarrative informational books, and only two of those read alouds included English nonnarrative informational books. Thus, based on our sample of data, Ms. C did not often read nonnarrative informational books, and was less prone to reading these genres of books in English. The finding that informational books are not
read as often as storybooks by the preschool teacher in the dual language preschool classroom mirrors research that shows the same trend in monolingual English preschool classrooms (Duke, 2003; Pentimonti, Zucker, & Justice, 2010; Yopp & Yopp, 2006). This also reinforces the possibility that Ms. C would not have as much experience or knowledge around reading nonnarrative informational books, and may engage with these books in ways that are similar to her discussion around storybooks, particularly if she has not received training on different approaches to reading narrative and nonnarrative informational genres.

**Teacher’s Instructional Practices**

A second model (presented below) to capture the ways in which Ms. C’s instructional practices varied across language of book/ instruction, book genres, and book content. The model demonstrates the findings which indicate that (a) variations in vocabulary and print knowledge targets emerged from differences in the language of book/ instruction and book genre, but not content of the book, (b) variations in nonnarrative targets and narrative targets were found to emerge from differences in language of book/ instruction and book content, but not genre of the book, and (c) variations in translanguaging practices were found to vary based upon the language of book/ instruction and book genre, rather than on the book content. Thus, language of book/ instruction, as the central construct in which the other constructs overlap, in terms of instructional practices, is what accounted for differences in the vocabulary, narrative, nonnarrative, and print knowledge targets that Ms. C discusses and the translanguaging practices that she implements to navigates the text for children.
Vocabulary Target Instruction

Vocabulary instruction was shown to differ across language of book/instruction in several ways. Abstract nouns were attended to more so in storybooks than nonnarrative informational books, whereas concrete nouns were attended to more so in nonnarrative informational books than storybooks. As suggested by previous research (Pappas, 1993), these abstract nouns were related to the intentions and reactions of characters as they moved through the story events. As such, the prevalence of abstract nouns in storybooks and in Ms. C’s extratextual talk may be attributed to the likelihood that discussion of these words helped clarify and deepen children’s understanding of the developing storyline. Instead, concrete nouns may have been more salient in the nonnarrative informational texts because attributes and characteristic events around the focal topics...
were being discussed, each of which was concrete in nature. Although prior research suggests that informational genres of books predominantly feature technical vocabulary (Torr & Clugston, 1999), the vocabulary in “The Tooth Book” and “Cuando Tomi se mueve” was more concrete than technical in nature given that these books describe the attributes and characteristic events around topics using lower tier vocabulary. However, given that these books included names of different animals and objects, in an effort to describe or demonstrate classifications of sorts, this vocabulary was “technical” in the manner in which it was being used to label and organize information that aligned with the purposes of the informational book genre (Pappas, 1993).

Moreover, even if there may have been several concrete nouns that were discussed in the storybook sessions, Ms. C may not have spent too much time on these vocabulary words given that there were abstract nouns that may have been more challenging for students to understand, and thus were favored for discussion. Within storybooks, abstract nouns were found to be more salient in ES than SS read alouds. Since Ms. C’s extratextual talk was more inviting of students’ input to summarize and explain vocabulary in the ES genre, there was more time and more interaction spent around the abstract nouns in the ES than the SS read aloud. Instead, in the SS activity, Ms. C usually took it upon herself to define abstract nouns, and did so in a very simple way that was much less developed than Ms. C’s explanation in the ES session. As such, not much time was spent in the SS genre discussing these types of words. Vocabulary targets did not differ based on the content or topic of the book in storybook or informational book settings.

Previous research showed that, during interactions with both informational and narrative texts, teachers explicitly highlighted technical lexis or academic terms by
defining or explaining the meaning of words (Bowers et al., 2010; Mohan & Slater, 2006; Peercy, 2011; Spycher, 2009; Torr & Clugston, 1999), providing related examples or synonyms (Spycher, 2009; Peercy, 2011, Mohan & Slater, 2006; Torr & Clugston, 1999), and repeating the vocabulary to explicitly signal the importance of the words and to call attention to their use (Hammond, 2006; Hansen-Thomas, 2009; Richardson-Bruna et al., 2007, Spycher, 2009; Zwiers, 2006). Ms. C was also found to engage in each of these behaviors (e.g., explaining vocabulary, emphasizing the text, reinforcing/clarifying student text-related answers). Thus, the findings of this study support the results of previous research indicating that teachers instruct children on vocabulary targets, including technical lexis, by defining, explaining, repeating, and providing examples of vocabulary terms. However, the findings of this research serve to expand on this knowledge by revealing that teachers’ use of these instructional strategies varied across storybook and informational book genres and the language of book/instruction. Vocabulary instruction was more prominent in storybooks, more dynamic in English than Spanish storybooks, and the teacher’s emphasis of vocabulary differed by language according to the structural differences between English and Spanish languages. This result points to the possibility that, along with informational books, storybooks provide a supportive context for the instruction of more technical types of vocabulary.

In contrast to the findings of previous studies which revealed that teachers’ highlighted the function of logical connectors in different ways during instruction in contexts where text was being read (e.g., Aguirre-Muñoz et al., 2008; Schleppegrell & de Oliveira, 2006, Hammond, 2006; Torr & Clugston, 1999; Zwiers, 2006), Ms. C was found not to emphasize or explicitly discuss her own or children’s use of different logical
connecters (e.g., conjunctions) during the reading of any genre or language of book. Rather, instances from the data showcase that, at times, her use of conjunctions was inappropriate and may have hindered children’s understanding of her questions and their ability to respond correctly. However, similar to the Torr & Clugston’s (1999) findings, conjunctions such as “if” and others that created conditional or cause-purpose relationships between ideas were more common in informational books and in Ms. C’s speech when reading informational books than in narrative books or when Ms. C read narrative books, regardless of the language of the book. This finding suggests that there may be particular structures of language that are more prominent in different genres of books, thus, emphasizing the importance of teachers reading a variety of book genres to children so that children are exposed to these specific structures in the text of the book, through the teacher’s talk around the book, and perhaps, in opportunities to engage productively around topics of the text.

Similarly, Ms. C did not explicitly call students’ attention to the processes (e.g., verb usage) or themes of sentences (e.g., participants), as was described in previous research. In terms of processes, this meant identifying different types of verbs (e.g., Aguirre-Muñoz et al., 2008; Schleppegrell & de Oliveira, 2006), highlighting their lexical cohesiveness in constructing relationships between two parts of a sentence (Mohan & Slater, 2006; Schleppegrell & de Oliveira, 2006), or showcasing their usage to construct more varied sentence structures (Aguirre-Muñoz et al., 2008). With regards to theme, this included instructing students about ways in which to expand noun phrases (Aguirre-Muñoz et al., 2008), the referencing and summarizing capacity of expanded noun phrases (Schleppegrell & de Oliveira, 2006), structures of noun groups relevant to specific genres
(Hammond, 2006), and the agency, power relations, and attitudinal meanings underlying expanded noun phrases (Schleppegrell & de Oliveira, 2006). The fact that Ms. C was not found to implement these strategies does not reflect poorly on her instructional practices. Instead, her inclusion of the explicit instructional techniques described in the literature would not have been developmentally appropriate since preschool students most likely had not yet developed the cognitive faculties with which to understand these concepts. Thus, the findings of these previous studies, which included older students who were in later elementary, middle, or secondary grades, were not expected to be replicated in the findings of my study.

More importantly, the incongruity of the instructional practices used by teachers of older populations, as described by previous research, and those strategies that could or should be used by early childhood educators like Ms. C, highlights how different early childhood educators’ instruction around academic language needs to be for young children in comparison to children in older elementary, middle, and secondary grades. More research in this area is needed in order to identify developmentally appropriate ways in which these teachers can support the emergence of young children’s academic language comprehension and development and the ways in which these contrast with strategies for older student populations. Moreover, more studies need to investigate the unique instructional practices that would support emergent bilingual students’ academic language development in two languages and which would encourage these children’s cross-linguistic understandings. Previous studies have initiated this investigation and revealed the utility of students’ L1 in helping students acquire and use more academic terms and structures as well as how strategies such as codeswitching and a focus on
cognates support this development (e.g., Ernst-Slavit & Mason, 2011; Peercy, 2011; Richardson-Bruna et al., 2007; Zwiers, 2006). However, further inquiry is needed in this area in order to determine the saliency of these particular methods with very young emergent bilingual students and the existence of others that may also be effective.

Unlike the results of previous research with bilingual teachers (Hansen-Thomas, 2009; Hayes et al., 2009; Peercy, 2011) which showed that they implemented unique cross-linguistic instructional practices around academic language, Ms. C did not explicitly support students’ dual language development by codeswitching or highlighting Spanish-English cognates as a way to teach vocabulary. There were many missed opportunities for Ms. C’s use of each of these strategies, which may suggest that in order for bilingual teachers to be aware and take advantage of these techniques, they may need more professional development in order to understand the most supportive and effective ways in which to support emergent bilingual children’s vocabulary learning and development (Howard, Sugarman, Christian, Lindholm-Leary, & Rogers, 2007).

**Narrative Target Instruction**

Narrative target instruction differed both across English and Spanish storybooks and by the content of each book. In terms of narrative instruction that changed across the languages of books, Ms. C was found to prompt students to recall the text in the ES genre, but encouraged students to interact differently in the SS genre, by recapping the text for them. These findings aligned with the discourse feature-based results showing that Ms. C was more apt to ask for student participation in the ES read aloud but summarized the text for children in the SS read aloud. These results indicated that Ms. C
did not provide equitable opportunities for children to participate orally in the read alouds or to co-construct the meaning of the text that Ms. C had just read. Although there is the possibility that Ms. C may have done so purposefully, the question remains as to why she did not prompt students with fill-in-the-blank questions, as she had in the ENNI read aloud, that would have allowed students to participate while still providing an ample amount of scaffolding. A possible motive may be that the teacher wanted to unpack the written language for children by recasting and paraphrasing the text in her own words for them and providing them with a second opportunity to listen to the information and to hear it being paraphrased in a simpler manner, given that her oral restatement of the information would contain less dense, written-like features (Gibbons, 2006).

Narrative target instruction also differed by the content of the book since Ms. C focused on character-based features of the story in the ES genre while focusing on the story event-based features of the story in the SS genre. Since the content of the books differed in a number of ways, specifically that the ES book featured more character interaction whereas the SS book had a more developed storyline, Ms. C’s differential attention to these two narrative aspects may have originated from the difference in book content. This may suggest that Ms. C was being responsive to the content of the book, highlighting and discussing the topics that were most salient in each particular book. Moreover, given the detailed nature of the Spanish storybook and in order to ensure that students were following along with the complex story events, Ms. C may have preferred to recap, and thus unpack, the text for students as way in which to facilitate their comprehension of the story events (Gibbons, 2006).
Nonnarrative Target Instruction

Nonnarrative target instruction differed across language of book/instruction and content of the book, namely that of ENNI and SNNI genres. While there was found to be more nonnarrative targets that were attended to in ENNI read alouds and more summary of characteristic events in this genre than in the SNNI genre, there was also more variety in terms of the nonnarrative targets that were attended to in the ENNI context. Given that the ENNI book was much more complex and well-developed than the SNNI book around nonnarrative features such as characteristic events, the content of the book may have influenced Ms. C’s nonnarrative target instruction such that she was more apt to discuss these features if they were more salient in the text. Although little research has documented the influence or extent of the influence of book content on reading and instruction within and across different genres of books, this finding is explained through Halliday’s (1985) functional theory of grammar. Based on the notion that (a) the organization of a teacher’s discourse features is directly connected to her purpose for instruction and that (b) features of the text (e.g., the genre and content of the book) affect the organization and structure of the book, the teacher’s purpose for instruction is guided by features of the text which in turn influences the discourse features in her extratextual talk of the book (Halliday & Hasan, 1985).

The language context also influenced the nonnarrative target instruction in that Ms. C provided more opportunities for children to summarize the characteristic events in the ENNI genre and provided them with more opportunities to participate orally in the read aloud. In contrast, there were fewer opportunities provided to students to engage in the discussion around nonnarrative targets in the SNNI genre given that Ms. C often
recapped the text for the students. On the other hand, Ms. C asked children to make book-to-life connections in the SNNI genre while she pointed out these connections for children in the ENNI read aloud. This may suggest that the level at which Ms. C encouraged students to engage with the informational text differed as a function of their language abilities. Similar to findings in our previous study with regards to teacher’s instructional strategies (Gort, Pontier, & Sembiante, 2012), Ms. C may have perceived the instructional strategy of prompting children to make book-to-life connections in the SNNI read aloud as a more indirect, and less cognitively challenging, way for children to engage with the concepts of the text while being able to discuss them using the target language. Rather, she requested that students engage more directly with the concepts in the ENNI book by having children summarize and recap the text, a strategy that positioned children to take a more active role in constructing and understanding the concepts in the text (Gibbons, 2006).

**Print Knowledge Target Instruction**

Print knowledge targets were found to differ across book genres and language of the book/instruction. Print knowledge targets like modeling the act of reading/writing or the act of referencing illustrations were attended to more so in storybooks than nonnarrative informational books. These findings indicate that print knowledge targets may have been more prevalent in the storybook genre rather than the nonnarrative informational genre because Ms. C was more apt to use the instructional strategy of segwaying to reading in this genre which helped to call student’s attention to the idea that continuing to read the book would reveal the next piece of the plot. This strategy was not a typical feature in NNI read alouds since there was no plot on which Ms. C could build.
anticipation, indicating that her instructional strategy of segwaying to reading was inherently tied to narrative genres of books and was not functional in the NNI read alouds.

In terms of language of the book/instruction, variation was also found in print knowledge targets within storybooks, such that more attention was given to print knowledge targets in the SS than the ES genres. For example, Ms. C was more apt to prompt children to reference the illustrations and did so in a more scaffolded manner in the SS genre than in the ES genre. Moreover, Ms. C more readily describe illustrations in the SS genre. Ms. C may have emphasized engagement with the illustrations in the SS genre as a way in which to scaffold children’s understanding of the details in the story events, which were more complex in comparison to those of the English storybook.

The findings of this study showed that Ms. C called students’ attention to global elements of the book through her reference to print knowledge targets such as the act of reading/writing, the act of referencing illustrations, and segwaying to reading. By continually alluding to events that would follow (i.e., the act of reading/writing and segwaying to reading), primarily in storybooks, or ways that the illustrations supported the meaning in the text (i.e., the act of referencing illustrations), primarily in informational books, the teacher emphasized elements of the genres the recurred, such as the sequence of events in storybooks, and the importance of illustrations to showcase focal subject matter in informational books. While Ms. C was shown to do this in indirect and implied ways, previous research showed that teachers instructed students about global elements in much more direct and explicit ways. For example, these included by identifying and having students identify specific structures belonging to different genres
(Hammond, 2006; Swami, 2008; Zwiers, 2006), highlighting grammatical features necessary for the communicative purposes and goal of the genre (Aguirre-Muñoz et al., 2008; Hammond, 2006; Swami, 2008), and pinpointing particular academic vocabulary used to discuss the structures of each genre or to be used within each structure of the genre (Hammond, 2006; Peercy, 2011; Zwiers, 2006). These instructional strategies were documented with teachers of older student populations than the students who participated in this study.

Thus, the results of my research may suggest that, similar to teachers of older student populations, early childhood teachers may also provide instruction to preschoolers on the global elements of the genres of books, albeit in more implicit and indirect ways. Moreover, Mrs. C differentiated her instruction around global elements according to the genre of the book and the characteristic features of that genre with regards to global elements. However, the teacher’s instruction around print knowledge targets also changed according to the language that she was teaching in, implying that instruction around these global elements may increase depending on the amount of direction and control the teacher exerts in the read aloud. In either case, the teacher’s implied and indirect instruction of global elements through print knowledge targets seems to be a more appropriate way to teach preschool children about the global elements of different genres of books rather than the techniques suggested by prior research with older students. More investigation would shed light on how teachers can be more intentional in this area and how these strategies could differ for dual language teachers who are teaching children about the global elements of books in two languages and across two genres of books.
Teacher’s Translanguaging Practices

Ms. C was found to translanguage more in the SS genre than the ES and SNNI genres and more in the ENNI genre than the SNNI and ES genres. In other words, when the SS and ENNI read alouds were compared to read alouds with the same genre of book in different languages (e.g., SS vs. ES; ENNI vs. SNNI) and when compared to read alouds in the same language but with different genres (e.g., SS vs. SNNI; ENNI vs. ES), the SS and ENNI sessions were found to include more translanguaging on the part of the teacher. This meant that features inherent to the SS read aloud (i.e., the storybook in Spanish) and the ENNI read aloud (i.e., the nonnarrative informational book in English) were linked to the teacher’s translanguaging practices. A commonality shared by the books read in the SS and ENNI read alouds was that the content of both books were more complex in nature than their English or Spanish counterpart. Thus, translanguaging may have been a strategy that Ms. C used to navigate the complexity of the text, specifically by translating prediction questions into English in the SS read aloud and by prompting students to discuss their book-to-life experiences in the ENNI read aloud. Moreover, Ms. C was found to translanguage with particular students rather than the class as a whole, and more specifically, with students whose dominant language was not the target language being used by Ms. C at the time. This may also indicate that Ms. C was strategic in her translanguaging practices since she integrated the use of both languages for specific purposes with these children to help facilitate their understanding and their ability to make connections to the text.
Trends in the data show that the teacher’s use of translanguaging in these read alouds was strategic pertaining to the genre and the language of book/instruction. In the SS genre, Ms. C may have used English to ensure that English-dominant children were able to understand and respond to inferential prediction and justification questions that she had asked in Spanish. These types of questions were most common to storybook reading and were an important way in which to engage students in critical thinking about the story events. Moreover, many of the children, who were not Spanish-dominant, may have needed additional support in the target language in order to understand and be able to answer these inferential types of questions. While this may have been the case, when code switching from Spanish to English, Ms. C did so in response to particular children (e.g., with Kyle) rather than to address all the English-dominant children in the class. This may indicate that Ms. C tried to remain in the target language and scaffold children’s understanding through other instructional strategies such as explaining. Among the many uses of translanguaging that have been documented in the field, Ms. C is shown to use translanguaging as a tool in which to create multiple opportunities for language learning (Martin-Beltrán, 2010) by stating her questions in English and recasting students’ English comments into Spanish, and to transmit information (Creese & Blackledge, 2010) so as to ensure that children are comprehending the line of discussion and questioning.

Instead, Ms. C may have engaged in translanguaging in the ENNI read aloud in order to ensure that students were making book-to-life connections with the content. In a parallel manner to the book-to-life connections that she prompted students to make with regard to the narrative targets in the SNNI read aloud, she used Spanish into the ENNI
read aloud to point out to students how their lived experiences mirrored the content in the book (e.g., Ernesto ya perdió un diente). In several of the occurrences in which translanguaging took place, Ms. C is found to be conversing with the same group of children when making or prompting these book-to-life connections. As such, the translanguaging may have originated from Ms. C’s efforts to use Spanish with this group of Spanish-dominant children in order to forge a personal connection with them, through use of the language that is most familiar (Levine, 2003; Martinez, 2010) and by make relevant connections between the academic content and their lived experiences in the language that was most familiar to them (Cook, 2001). Thus, the genre of the book may have been a factor in Ms. C’s translanguaging, as she integrated both Spanish and English to make sure that children were understanding the content, finding the information interesting, and were able to navigate the structure. For example, Ms. C engaged in translanguaging in order to highlight a child’s experiences with his growing teeth, but since this particular child, Ernesto, was a Spanish dominant emergent bilingual student, she may have used Spanish in order to forge the book-to-life connection more strongly and in a more familiar way for him. Thus, Ms. C engaged in translanguaging practices as a function of the genre of book and the language of book/instruction.

Ms. C’s translanguaging practices may have also looked different across English and Spanish read aloud contexts because of Ms. C’s proficiency and level of comfort between English and Spanish. Although she was capable of instructing in either language, as a native speaker of Spanish, she may have preferred using that code when forging more personal connections with students, as was shown in the data when she prompted book-to-life connections exclusively in Spanish. Instead, the function of her
translanguaging in English during Spanish read alouds appeared to be more pragmatic in nature, since she used English to help prompt students’ predictions and clarify children’s text-related responses. Thus, these findings indicate that bilingual teachers may translanguge for different reasons across instructional language contexts and in different ways given the language with which they have a deeper personal connection (or in which they have a stronger background) and in relation to students who also share have a deeper personal connection – or more developed proficiency - in that same language (i.e., Ms. C and Spanish-dominant children).

**Implications**

The results of this study inform the field with regard to ways in which teachers apprentice children (Rogoff, 1990; Vygotsky, 1987) in different genre-specific registers of academic discourse at the initial stages of schooling. These findings are unique to those already documented in the field since little research describes teachers’ genre- and language-specific instructional practices across narrative and informational texts in bilingual preschool classrooms. I suggest several important implications for teachers’ instructional practices around navigating narrative and informational texts in Spanish and English target languages.

Teachers need to be wary of the amount of commands, questions, and statements they use during a read aloud since the ratio of these features directly impacts the degree to which children are able to orally participate in the read aloud. Since the genre of book that teachers read and the language of book/instruction both influence the amount of commands, questions, and statements that teachers use during a read aloud, teachers can
be more cognizant of their discourse by paying closer attention to the mood of their extratextual talk with different genres of books in different languages and attempting to represent a variety of instructional strategies equitably across read alouds with different genres of books in different languages. It is important that teachers use a range of instructional strategies during read alouds because each technique apprentices the child into the different ways of engaging with the text and the targets (i.e., narrative, nonnarrative) that are an appropriate focus in each reading.

Results from this study showed that at times, the teacher navigated the nonnarrative informational texts by focusing on narrative aspects (e.g., characters, storyline, character action). It is also imperative the teachers are aware of the contrasting features of different genres of books and are knowledgeable about how to read each genre in ways that align with their purpose, as designated by their structure, organization, and global structures and elements. Previous research has shown that teachers may be operating under false assumptions about informational books, such as that they are too difficult for children. In the current study, the results suggested that the teacher conducted a more controlled read aloud, in terms of children’s oral participation, with NNI read alouds than with storybook sessions, regardless of language. Thus, training around the benefits, use, and methods of reading with different genres of books in different languages is a valuable and necessary topic of professional development for many teachers, and especially those who are teaching in dual language programs.

For those teachers in dual language settings, additional training should be required in order to train them in the methods and approaches to conducting read aloud activities that account for and are authentic to each language in the dual language program.
Findings from the current study showed that there were very little linguistic-based differences in Ms. C’s reading of similar genres across languages. The lack of language-based differences in the way that Ms. C conducted each read aloud indicated that she was reading, interacting, and navigating the books in similar ways, and thus inauthentically for either the English or Spanish book. Instead, dual language teachers should follow different instructional practices and should demonstrate different discourse features with books in different languages. This should not be the case, however, since Spanish and English are structured differently and literacy practices in each language should reflect language and cultural differences. Since the structures of English and Spanish are different and the ways in which one would need to be provided with training that is specific to bilingual instruction and the ways in which literacy activities such as read alouds are conducted in

Given that the textual features of books vary by genre and by content of the book, it is important that teachers read a range of books representing a variety of genres and topics in different languages. This will ensure that shared reading discussions are diverse in topic, are driven by different purposes according to the genre of the book, and are working to expose and familiarize children to the structures and the ways of engaging with different genres. Teachers should also be wary of the way that they go about reading the text. A finding from this study showed that Ms. C’s efforts to shorten the length of the book led to paraphrasing whereby she eliminated important features of the text, such as the conjunction that served to contrast the information in two phrases that represented an important event in the story. Thus, when trying to minimize the duration of a read aloud, teachers should determine a place in the text to stop reading, rather than paraphrasing the
story to reach the end. Through training, teachers could also be made aware of the roles and functions of each textual feature, as well as how they can incorporate more explicit teaching around these features, in a developmentally-appropriate, contextualized manner that will support children’s learning of academic discourse across different genres of text in different languages. Such instruction will also provide valuable opportunities for teachers to make cross-linguistic comparisons for children and to highlight the similarities and differences in concepts of literacy, print, and language structures across English and Spanish.

The results of this study suggest several implications for future research regarding the functionality of teachers’ instructional and discourse practices across different genres and in different languages. The first of these is that, not only was the book genre found to have an influence on teacher’s discourse features - as was shown in previous research with monolingual children - but in dual language preschool contexts, the teacher’s discourse features during read alouds were influenced by the language of book/instruction and the content of the book. Often, it was a combination of these aspects that resulted in qualitative variations in the teacher’s discourse features. Thus, future research should take into account these influences on the teacher’s instruction and should conduct additional studies to investigate the particular influence that each of these characteristics exert on teacher practice with books that represent these different features as well as the functionality of children’s discourse features in read alouds across different genres and languages. Specifically, the children’s discourse should be analyzed in relation to the teacher’s discourse features and the book’s textual features, as well as the language of the book/instruction and the content of the book, as informed by the results
of this study. In addition, analyses of children’s discourse could also be compared with
the specific instructional strategies and targets used by the teacher.

The use of SFL as a theoretical model and lens through which to study the
functionality of teachers’ discourse and instruction is useful in learning more about how
teachers help support children’s bilingual and biliteracy development and how teachers
apprentice children into ways of knowing that are valued in school. Moreover, the use of
this theory and framework allowed for the analysis of discourse features across two
languages and two genres – information that helps to expand upon prior studies having
used this theory and lens, but with monolingual children in monolingual classroom
contexts.

The analytical approaches that were used in this study also present a unique way
in which to approach the future study of teachers’ instructional practices in early
childhood classrooms. Previously, most researchers have either analyzed teacher’s
instructional practices using microethnographic approaches that serve to investigate and
analyze larger themes and trends in instruction and communication, or analyzed teacher’s
linguistic structures using a functional grammar approach to expose and study the
microstructures of language in relation to their function. I juxtaposed these two
analytical approaches in this study in order to understand and document the relationship
between the teacher’s language use and her instructional focus across read alouds that
were organized around books with different purposes (i.e., genres) and in different
languages. The use of both of these analytical lenses, which are representative of two
different levels of analysis, allowed for a much more salient link between the
investigation of the structural features of language and their organization around a
specific purpose, a central tenet of the Systemic Functional Linguistic theory. Moreover, this approach was especially useful in the context of studying a teacher’s instruction across two different languages, since they represent two different grammatical systems in which language is used and structured differentially while serving a similar purpose within the narrative and nonnarrative genres. Further research should apply these analytical approaches together in order to continue investigation of the use and development of two languages in educational contexts where each is being used around a common purpose.

Given that the juxtaposition of a functional grammar approach and microethnographic analysis emphasizes the importance of understanding the context and thus, the purpose, of the larger activity in which the instruction is taking place, the connection of these two approaches helps to better represent the original tenet of SFL, which is that language is structured as a function of its purpose. The use of both approaches also helps to expand the utility of this theory as applicable to contexts where different languages, comprising of different language structures, are being used for similar and differing instructional purposes. In this study, this approach was applied to the investigation of a focal teacher in a classroom, however, these two analytical lenses can be applied in subsequent studies to examine the language of other members of the classroom, such as the instruction and language use of assistant teachers, or the language learning, use, and development of children and/or peers, in different activities that are organized around different purposes (i.e., show-and-tell, dramatic play, block time, table toys, story retells, etc.). There are certainly many applications for the combined use of
these two analytical lenses within multilingual educational environments as well as within social contexts outside of school where multiple languages are spoken.

**Limitations of this Study**

While the case study design encompasses various strengths as a research approach, there are several limitations that restrict the usefulness or generalizability of the results. Although findings of teachers’ academic instructional practices will include a rich and holistic account of a phenomenon, the results only allow a description of the behaviors and not an explanation of them (Merriam, 2009). No generalizations or cause-and-effect relationships can be drawn from the results given that the study involves only a few individuals and may not be representative of larger samples or populations (Bassey, 1999). Since researchers are required to be subjective in the data collection, coding, and analytic procedures in which they engage, the case study approach has also been faulted for issues of reliability and external validity (Hamel, Dufour, & Fortin, 1993). Issues of ethics can arise from the biases of the researcher, which can significantly skew emerging themes in the final product if the biases remain unchecked (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

However, subjectivity as a limitation of case study research is also a paradox of its strength (Hancock & Algozzine, 2006), since the human element of this approach is what enables the close examination and understanding of social complexities and people’s behaviors. The findings from this study can be used to inform similar situations (Erickson, 1986) or can be used in various ways to support the work of other researchers (Stake, 2005). The thick, rich description allows the reader to decide in what way the information is transferable to the context of their own work (Lather, 2001). This study
provides insight into ways in which Spanish-language children’s books can be categorized into the genres specified by Donovan & Smolkin (2002) as well as what academic discourse features teachers highlight in their book-based interactions with children, and how these language practices are functional for bridging academic language for children. Nevertheless, the findings of this study cannot be generalized to all teachers in bilingual preschool programs.

While it is important to examine both the students’ and teachers’ input in classroom interactions, the scope of this study allows only for the investigation of a teacher’s academic discourse practices as separate rather than in conjunction with students’ responses. Thus, results of this study do not take into account teachers’ responsiveness to students or the influence of teachers’ academic discourse practices on students’ use of specific language structures. The rationale in support of this decision was that in order to study students’ language use in shared reading contexts, more light needed to be shed on the language structures inherent in the focal books and in the teacher’s own talk as she attempted to navigate text representing various genres for children. These findings help build a foundation for future studies related to students’ academic language development and use across shared readings with different genres of books in different languages.

Another limitation of the study was that the focal Spanish language books did not represent authentic Spanish texts since both were translations of books that were originally written in English. This meant that the Spanish language books that were used in the study were translated and may have included language structures that were not authentic to the target language (Nida, 1975) or stories that are not culturally-relevant.
according to the target culture of the language in which the book has been translated (O’Sullivan, 1993). All of the Spanish books that were read by the focal teacher in the study were translations from original English versions of the text since many of the books belonged to the OWL© curriculum, and thus more authentic choices were not available. This was a direct consequence of the decision to collect naturalistic data in which there was no researcher influence on the classroom activities or environment.

**Conclusion**

This chapter presented a synthesis of the findings of the study and a discussion of the results as they relate to prior and future research. This qualitative case study examines the nature of a dual language preschool teacher’s instructional practices and extratextual talk during shared-book reading practices with two different genres of books in Spanish and English. Since language is the way in which meaning and information is conveyed, a close investigation of the linguistic structures used in teachers’ instructional practices during book-sharing activities can inform the ways in which teachers scaffold and apprentice students in the academic discourses represented within and across different genres of books. Moreover, this study was also designed in order to shed light on a cross-linguistic genre comparison designed to determine if similar genres across languages contain language-specific features and structures.

Prior research has provided information on the discourse features of different genres of texts, and fewer studies have analyzed teacher’s discourse features in relation to these texts in monolingual settings. The information garnered by this research is unique in that it documents and describes the discourse features of a teacher when instructing in English and Spanish with storybooks and informational books. The study revealed that
book genre determined the organization of the dual language preschool teacher’s message, the role that she assumed in the read aloud, and the knowledge and content that she navigated for children in her speech. Moreover, the findings showed that the language of the book or instruction along with the genre and content of the book, determined differences in the teacher’s instructional and translanguaging practices that she implements to navigate the text for children. The results of this study helped to expand our current knowledge by adding to the current literature on monolingual discourse and textual features. In addition, this study provided a functional analysis of the discourse features behind a teacher’s instructional practices.

The findings, and thus implications, are unique to those already documented in the field since little research describes teachers’ genre- and language-specific instructional practices across narrative and informational texts in bilingual preschool classrooms. While teachers need to be more cognizant of their discourse features during read alouds, they should be sure to choose a variety of books, in terms of genre, content, and language, in order to ensure that their discussions around these texts are diverse and expose children to book-reading activities with different functions and purposes. Moreover, teachers should be mindful of their instructional practices and the characteristics of the book reading activity that influences their focus on different strategies and different targets, especially in the minority language in which the most restrictive instruction was shown to take place. Future research should take into account the influences of book genre, content, and language when conducting additional studies to investigate the functionality of teachers’ discourses across multiple examples of
storybooks and informational books, as well as the functionality of children’s discourse features in read alouds across different genres and languages.
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